

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF CHARACTER
SOME PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF MORAL
TRAINING

by

SAMUEL RAY BRADEN, A. B.

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the

GRADUATE SCHOOL

of the

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

1924

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF CHARACTER
SOME PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF MORAL
TRAINING

by

SAMUEL RAY BRADEN, A. B.

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the

GRADUATE SCHOOL

of the

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

1924



Foreword

The underlying principle of this study is that the essential elements of moral character must be wrought out of the nature of human personality. Mankind harbors within itself those traits out of which come what society terms both morality and immorality. In one respect, then, the study agrees with the orthodox viewpoint in Christianity. Man may be thought of as having within himself a sinful nature. It is no concern of this study how this nature originated. But it is the concern of this study how man's nature may be changed so that he may become in all respects moral, rather than immoral. This study also seeks to show that the science of psychology has much to offer that is fundamental in man's moral development. It is hardly necessary to state that the study reflects much of the philosophy of Dr. William Henry Pyle, under whose supervision it was made. Whatever of merit there is in it is due to his inspiration.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41554030_0070

PSYCHOLOGY AND CHARACTER

OR

Some Psychological Aspects of Moral Education

THE MEANING OF MORALITY

Chapter I

EDUCATION A SLOW PROCESS. Men have only partially learned how to live. Even the most civilized have but begun to understand the art of living, for living is an art which is mastered slowly. Men are not intelligent, noble, generous, and kind without a determined struggle to attain such characteristics. So much is this true that in the past many thinkers have decided that the virtues resided outside of the human personality. Virtue was a kind of magical possession which one acquired by good fortune or as a gift from the hand of deity. Man's inborn nature changes but slowly, and consequently the task of producing better men is a tedious one. To secure a better humanity the life's goal of each man must be changed somewhat. Otherwise there is little or no progress either for the individual or for the race. "Our natures must be materially changed before we are fit to live together in any degree of harmony and happiness. All the virtues on which democracy rests must be developed in us or strengthened by training. Nearly all the pain and suffering and sorrow in the world arise directly or indirectly out of selfishness, unkindness, and lack of sympathy."¹ The necessity for some kind of tuition in the art of living is obvious to any one who notices the numerous acts of impropriety and inconsiderateness in any group of persons. Some of these acts spring from ignorance, some from thoughtlessness, some from prejudice, some from selfishness, and some from hatred. To whatever cause we may trace the action, it is obvious that the number of misdeeds due to ignorance, carelessness, and prejudice might be lessened somewhat by means of education. And though it is admittedly more difficult to repress the deeds which spring from selfishness and hatred, we may believe that there is some way of changing one's attitude so that he need not go on forever making the same inborn responses to the stimuli of his outer world. "We are born with a nervous system with some differences in resistance to various types of stimuli already established. But any conceivable connection of stimuli with responses is possible. We have the nerves. They go on the one hand to sense organs; on the other to muscles. The stimulus-response couplings that are possible are practically infinite, regardless of the inherited couplings. Not only are inherited bonds not the basis of all acquirements, but we can overcome and reverse inherited differential resistances."² In a sense, then, the most hopeful as well as the most important fact about human nature is that it can be changed. Individuals can be controlled so that given goals may be reached. If

1. Pyle, William Henry, *The Teacher's Ideals of Life and Happiness*. Ed. 1, Columbia, Mo. The Missouri Book Company, 1920. Pages 69-70.

2. Pyle, William Henry, *The Psychology of Learning*. Ed. 1, Columbia, Mo. The Missouri Book Company, 1920. Page 270.

the behaviour of the individual can be thus influenced, we may hope to do the same with groups of individuals in any conceivable number. Hence we may speak of changing human nature. Such is the problem of this book. In order to know how human nature may be changed, improved, corrected, and permanently directed it is necessary to discuss many relevant matters such as, for example, the nature and meaning of morality in its general and specific aspects. The processes involved in bringing about desired changes in the individual and in the society or societies of which he is a member will also be considered.

MEANING OF MORALITY. The simplest definition of morality is that it is good or right conduct. The moral man is the good man. But such a simple definition will not suffice, because there is no fixed agreement concerning what right conduct is. The phrase "right conduct" does not mean the same to A and B who have disagreed and gone to court, each one claiming that he is conducting himself in a right manner and that the other is conducting himself in a wrong manner. And this difference of opinion grows more serious if A and B are nations about to go to war, involving the sacrifices and possible death of millions. In common speech morality is used in two very different senses. Sometimes we speak of morality absolutely, that is, we speak of morality as being related to or instrumental in the achievement of the highest good, the *summum bonum*. Obviously, however, what is the highest good to one man might be a bore, if not a curse, to another. But when we consider the inherent capacities of human nature in the aggregate, that is, of society at large, we may say that the *summum bonum* for man is what is best for both him and society. Morality in this sense refers to that conduct which leads to the most meaningful life for the individual, a member of a larger group. This conception makes allowance for the infinite development of the race toward an ever fuller and richer life. The moral man or the moral group is not one which has attained a perfect life, but rather one which is in the process of attaining it. The result of such living presumably would be that, for the generations following, somewhat more of what we call "goodness" would be evident. It would mean also that to some degree man would be able more easily to master his environment. Each generation of men would also be able to advance morally further than their fathers because they would have ascertained the good ends for which they should strive. As a result, they would need to do less moral experimentation. If each generation of men could accept the moral findings of their fathers, many moral blunders might be avoided. In the absolute sense, morality is the conduct which produces the maximum of life for the largest number of men. It refers to the moral life man could live if he would.

More often morality refers to what is socially approved. This is what many writers call the relative view of morality. The opinions of a certain group change from time to time, and what is deemed right in one century may be punished by law in another. Whereas the absolute conception posits a morality which, if actually attained, would be the best—and possibly final,—relative morality implies that man has not certainly learned what is the best and the highest. What is at a given period thought right may prove later to be either unnecessary or actually injurious because it provokes harmful attitudes and responses. Bushee and others think that the idea of an absolute morality is open to serious objection.³ They argue that there is no standard of morality

3. Bushee, Frederick A., *Principles of Sociology*. Ed. 1, New York, Henry Holt & Company, 1923. Pages 465-66.

adequate for all the successive stages of progress. But they fail to take into consideration that most thinkers have never meant by "absolute" that which was unalterable or invariable. At least, in the moral sense "absolute" morality may refer simply to that conduct which enables man to live the most harmonious and helpful life both for himself and for society. For the sake of clarity we may say that absolute morality refers to the highest social conduct of which man is capable—the attainment of the highest good. Relative morality refers to the conduct approved by society at any given time or stage of progress. Such a conception will be objected to by some, but for the present it will serve to point out further problems which must be faced in determining the nature of morality. At least we shall see that relative morality must never be considered as man's final achievement in social conduct. Man must be kept aware of his own possibilities of moral improvement. But if man is to improve, he must have something toward which to aim, some goal, some ideal of life which presents something bigger and better than that which he has at present attained. In this sense it will be helpful to think of absolute morality as man's highest good. Relative morality is the nearest man can approach to his highest good in his weakness and ignorance. Relative morality is, in a sense, an interim morality. It is not final, and must be constantly improved.

MORAL ATTAINMENT. But it must be kept in mind that morality is not something which a man may possess as he possesses a watch or a farm; nor is it something which a group may possess as a road or a courthouse. Morality is not something which can be borrowed from others; it is not a commodity of trade and barter. Morality is a manner of living. Through the individual's own activity he forms himself. His conduct is, therefore, both physical and mental. Goodness which exists merely in the mind is not conduct, but merely good intention. While we sometimes say that the good Lord counts good intentions as if they were good deeds, we also say that good intentions pave the way to hell. As Keith shows,⁴ such virtues as kindness and forbearance imply a motor activity. Something is done. One is a carpenter because he performs the "carpenter-activity". One is a musician because he manipulates the instrument in such a way that harmony is produced. So honesty is the result of honest actions, industriousness is the result of regular toil and work, helpfulness is the result of actually aiding others. One *becomes* good only by performing good deeds. One who habitually does what is right is a good man. But since habitual action is more or less reflex in nature, our problem is to establish in the child as early as possible definite responses to the stimuli of his environment. In so far as it is possible, we must make it a part of the child's very nature to act always in the way that is best for him and for others. Therefore, mere information will not suffice. Along with information there must go *training*. The aim of education is not merely to inform the child about what he ought to do, but to train him in the *actual doing* of good deeds. Instruction in moral and ethical theory must not be abstracted from life. As Hudson⁵ points out, abstract information in morals is apt to lead the young mind to moral sophistry which is the very antithesis of true morality. There is danger also that in any attempt to help the youth acquire good moral habits we moralize so much that the whole process becomes distasteful. Perhaps the most serious

4. Keith, John A. H., *Elementary Education*, Ed. 1, Chicago, Scott, Foresman & Co., 1907. Page 89.

5. Hudson, Jay William, *The College and New America*. Ed. 1, New York, D. Appleton & Co., page 114.

danger in any plan for moral attainment is that we shall give the impression that morality is an appendage to life itself. That is, the youth may get the impression that morality can be isolated, that it is something that one can elect if he chooses, but which is not required. He really may admire those who are conspicuously ahead of others in moral attainment without ever desiring that the virtues he respects in others shall become virtues which characterize him. It is not surprising that many able minds have decided that morals can not be taught in a course—that morals can not be put into education—but that the only hope of improving human conduct lies in making the whole process of education moral. Moral attainment is possible only when we regard morality as a mode of living which affects all of a man's participations in life. Not the man who assents to the right, but the man who does what is right is the desirable citizen.

PUBLIC OPINION AND MORALS. For the most part the sanctions of moral conduct are to be found in the laws of a society, in public opinion, and in religion. But no one of these three factors is permanent. Laws may be changed from time to time. What is more likely, laws may cease to be enforced because of an indifferent public opinion, and because of a religion which has lost its power to control men socially. As societies advance, there is a tendency to increase the number of laws in order to shift the responsibility from the individual to the larger group. The continuous making of numerous laws usually indicates an unwholesome condition in society. When men as individuals are living altruistically there is little need for more than a few simple laws. When public opinion is apathetic towards unsocial acts, people wink at the laws and thus the very rules which supposedly express their moral ideals are brought into ill repute. Moreover, when religion emphasizes its institutional nature unduly and fails to instruct a given generation in its great purposes to serve and bless humanity, moral carelessness is almost sure to follow. In short, neither the authority of law, nor the unwritten law of public opinion, nor the idealism of religion is a permanent factor. Any one of them, or all of them at once, may become impotent to direct men properly in the path of noble living.

The reason for this is obvious. Hobhouse⁶ shows that the problem of morality is due to life's manifold complexities. Life does not consist in the doing of certain sets of unrelated actions. Since human beings act largely from inborn impulses, human actions when unguided and not unified are by nature more or less chaotic. Hobhouse dwells much on harmony. Rational persons, he believes, can turn the chaos which results from following the inborn impulses into a rational harmony. He would develop personality in such a way that "a harmonization of impulse-feelings; and control of the conditions on which the success of every impulse depends, that is to say, of the world of experience generally, so far as it affects the individual" would result. This is our problem. Because life is complex—complex for every individual—there must be some adequate standards of social living and some effective means by which the group helps the individual achieve successful living. Just as the group expects the individual to devote his life to its highest interests, so the individual has a right to expect help from the group.

The chief difficulty in the matter of public opinion is that it is too often not clearly expressed. Perhaps even more serious, it is frequently not founded

6. Hobhouse, L. T., *The Rational Good*, pp. 142-143.

upon rational bases. But granted that in the experience of men, certain customs, manners, and opinion have a rational basis, it is universally true that in handing down traditional customs, manners, and beliefs from one generation to another, the reasons underlying them are soon forgotten and there is little left but the husk of outward formality. The kernel of necessity and therefore of reason has been forgotten. We teach our children the "thats" of social conduct and neglect the "whys."

There are two well established ways of thinking. One is to generalize from a few particulars, to jump at conclusions, to substitute guessing for analysis. This method leads to a minimum of truth and a maximum of errors. It is an easy method, and because it leads to the acquisition of some truth, it is espoused by the great masses of humanity. The other method is that of the careful collecting of data, of analyzing them, of studying them, until, finally, some facts are evident. This method, usually called scientific, leads men to discover the maximum of truth with the minimum of error. But this way is narrow, "and few there be that find it." Consequently, the masses of men do not think carefully. Public opinion contains a large element of error because there has not been selective and critical thinking. Public opinion is built up largely by means of the "hit and miss" method of arriving at conclusions. What Ellwood⁷ says of the church is even more universally true. He finds that the church, for example, has never taught true Christianity to its subjects, and that consequently Christendom is full of men who are pagans so far as their lives and deeds are concerned. Ellwood thinks the function of religion is "to conserve, propagate, and develop social values and ideals; but these to be sound must rest upon adequate knowledge." But is not the same true of public opinion in general? Must not it always rest upon "adequate knowledge" if it is to be wholesome and reliable? Again, the same author says "the world is perishing for lack of knowledge of the way in which human beings should live together. The church holds one key to this knowledge; social science holds the other. Here, then, is the secret of effective control over the formation of public opinion in order to create a Christian world: let the church use not only the key of Christian ideals, but also the key of scientific social knowledge."

We are now ready to conclude that public opinion is not a safe guardian of morality unless public opinion itself has the following characteristics: (1) It must rest upon all the known findings of human experience, that is, it must be rational. (2) It must constantly be corrected, revised, and cleared of all that is mere supposition and superstition. (3) It must not regard its authority as final at any given time, but it must always recommend a higher level of life to present and future generations. There is need for thought upon this third characteristic because the tendency of public opinion is to look only to the past, choosing and magnifying whatever is good. But it must also look to the future, asking what the needs of men in the years to come will be. Before the needs of a given generation are felt, public opinion ought to be able to provide for them. In other words, we can have no adequate morality unless public opinion is creative, self-corrective, and desirous of improvement.

MORALITY AND IDEALS. In a sense public opinion furnishes the individual his ideals. Each member of society is governed largely by what is expected of him. It is a mere truism to say that this influence may work either for good

7. Ellwood, Charles A., *The Formation of Public Opinion*, *Religious Education*, Vol. XV, p. 80.

or for evil. If society encourages the individual to do the things which are right, he is spurred on to higher attainments. If, however, society encourages him to do the things which are wrong, he becomes satisfied with low moral standards. Aside from the ideals which society, through public opinion, may furnish the individual, he has longings and aspirations which are his own as much as is his body. They are so much his own that society may be wholly ignorant of them. The function of these personal ideals is to give meaning and purpose to life. By means of them each man evaluates life. He decides that some things are worth securing at any cost, and that other things are not worth any effort at all. He orders his life accordingly. Working toward his ideals gives him pleasure and satisfaction. Not to do so brings him pain and disappointment.

If society could make ideals for the individual, the problem might be greatly simplified. Society might conceivably carefully study out a set of ideals which it could safely recommend to the individual. In fact, to a large degree, society has already done so. Yet each individual must choose his own ideals, and in the choosing he has great variety. He may choose good or bad ideals. If he makes one choice, he will become a benefactor to his fellow-men. If he makes another choice, he may become abusive of the rights of others, and leave behind him a wake of pain and misery. This gives the educator his problem. While he cannot choose ideals for the individual, he can guide and influence him. Perhaps he can recommend certain lines of endeavor and discourage the individual from others.

There ought to be a co-ordination between the ideals of society and those of the individual. No greater curse can come to a man than to suppose that society expects little or nothing of him. One of the tasks of society is to see that no individual has any just ground for such an opinion. Thorndike thinks that "the prizes which education ought to seek are all within its power. The results for which a rational mankind would strive are determined largely by mankind itself. For the common good it is indifferent who is at the top—which men are achieving most. The important thing for the common good, for all men, is that the top should be high—that much should be achieved. To the absolute welfare of all men together, education is the great contributor." What we must never forget, however, is that the ideals of society cannot be enriched apart from lofty individual ideals. Individual ideals which are both noble and rational may become social ideals. This may come about not merely because they are noble and rational, but because they are espoused and taught by people who are supposed to know life's values. Society has a confident attitude toward a certain group of people with respect to knowledge. It virtually says, "these people ought to know; therefore if they say so, it is best." Teachers, preachers, editors, and others hold a kind of authority over the popular mind. Whatever teachers teach and preachers preach and editors write bids fair to become the opinion of society at large. Therefore, the individual who has ideals and ideas may hope to have them accepted by the masses if he can first get them accepted by the "thinking" element in society. The reason this fact is not more apparent is that it is only seldom that among the intellectual leadership of society we find unanimity of purpose. But if there were unanimity of purpose, the results could be predicted. The closing of the saloon in the United States illustrates the principle we are attempting to set forth.

One of the difficult problems we face in moral education is the fact that many youths seem not to have right ideals. Apparently there is nothing toward which they are planning and shaping their lives. Seemingly, they have no imagination, they have built no air-castles, they have dreamed no dreams. All youth probably do have ideals which seem good to them. Not to have ideals of success and usefulness is probably a mark of mental inferiority. For the present, however, it must be emphasized that ideals are closely associated with personal development. Ideals seem to work both from without and from within. They beckon the youth toward them and they also seem to create an inner urge which keeps youth on the journey till the goal is reached. Since this is true, it is important for both the individual and society that every child has a set of ideals. And it is important that these ideals be worthy.

MORALITY AND SOCIAL PROGRESS. Sociologists pretty well agree that society cannot remain long in a given state. There must be change, growth, development. Social progress is the adaptation of society to a larger and more meaningful environment. If society has a goal, it apparently is the goal of adapting itself to an environment which affords all the necessary factors for the welfare and development of its members. If this is true, then social progress must supply the materials and conditions out of which its members can create a harmony which has in it abiding elements. One way to create such a harmony will be to provide the members with sufficient opportunities for work, for rest, for recreation, and for mental and spiritual culture. It will also furnish men with whatever opportunities are necessary to insure the survival and sound structure of the entire group. Morality, then, is indispensable if social progress is to be attained; because morality always implies some degree of altruism, helpfulness, and good will without which there can be no social harmony. Even in family life if men are not bound together by harmonious bonds, the family society immediately disintegrates. On the other hand, a wholesome, rational morality is a great integrating force, binding men together to perform tasks which lie somewhat outside of the pale of selfish desire and thus an *esprit de corps* is formed. Morality, seen from this angle, is not an end in itself, but a force or influence which exists for the accomplishment of a purpose or an ideal. When we see a really progressive society, be it large or small, we can be sure that we shall find two elements: a high purpose, or one which at least temporarily seems high, and sufficient moral strength to enable the group to move toward the attainment of that purpose. The achievements of such peoples as the Jews, the Scotch, or the American colonists furnish many instances of the working of this principle. Many writers draw sharp distinctions between these two influences, but for our purpose it is sufficient to point out the mutual relationship between social progress and a sound morality. At least it ought to be seen that morality in its deeper meaning is not thought of as being a goal towards which men should strive; but it is rather the dynamic force which performs the double task of helping men choose a worthy goal and then supplying the strength, patience, and courage which are necessary to attain it.

MORALITY AND EDUCATION. It is almost impossible to discuss education in a helpful way because one cannot define the term so that it bears a clear concept to others. However, if we simply say that at least two functions of education are to inform and to train, that is, to teach the child what is desirable and to cause him to do what is desirable, we have a conception of education which will suffice here. It is evident that morality implies education of some

kind. Morality is a social term and implies teaching. Nor can there be morality if there is no training in good conduct and behavior. When we use the term education, however, we are in the habit of thinking of some kind of an institution by which in some more or less regular and formal way children are instructed and trained. The home and the school furnish the best examples in modern times. As societies become more complex, these two institutions are called on to do their educational work ever more formally. And in recent years the tendency is for the home to depend more and more upon the school to instruct and train the children not only in those experiences which are thought to be helpful in the future life of the child in earning a livelihood, but also in what we call morals and conduct. Since this is true, then what we call our educational system has a very definite relationship to morality. But suppose we do not divorce morality from the home—suppose that we keep both the home and the school system as at least two of the institutions which educate each succeeding generation—then it is evident that if we need a more virile morality, because of changing social conditions, it is the business of these two institutions to help produce such a morality. On this point Pyle⁹ says, "Teachers know the kind of citizen that is desired. Every father knows what sort of man he would have his son become. What is wanted by both parents and teachers is information concerning the laws of mental development, and methods of training planned in harmony with these laws—methods that will lead to certain, definite, desirable action." In other words, both school and home need to know more about human nature from the standpoint of its changes and development, and then they need to outline a full course of activities based upon the laws of human development. This is a gigantic task for both the home and the school, and requires that something be said of the aims of education in the light of its relation to morality.

Saxby¹⁰ thinks that a "fine" character is one which has strength of mind, a master sentiment, and a realization that each man must make allowances for his prejudices. To quote: "We judge the quality of a person's character at least as much by the nature of his master sentiment as by the consistency of his behavior; in fact, of the two, many of us are more inclined to forgive weakness than what we consider a "poor" aim in life. By common consent a really fine man must have plenty of "strength of mind" and he must use his powers in service of a principle which we admire. Perhaps one other qualification should be added for members of a community such as ours, that is, a clear realization of the personal prejudices for which he has to make allowance in all his decisions." This conception is not popular with many recent educators who stress behavior and action. But Saxby is right in so far as he emphasizes that right thinking or noble thinking must precede right or noble living. From his viewpoint, the process of becoming a "fine" man is so difficult that all men cannot attain it. But if a man has discovered a great principle to which he turns all his powers, he may at least be thought to have begun noble living. It is the ever recurring problem of the spirit being willing and the flesh being weak, but in the last analysis, it must be admitted that it is important for the spirit to be willing. Pyle¹¹ believes that "we want a race of men for whom crime will be impossible, not because of a moral precept that has been learned, but because they have never committed crime, and it is not in accord with their

9. Pyle, *The Outlines of Educational Psychology*, p. 165.

10. Saxby, I. B., *The Education of Behavior*, p. 178.

11. Pyle, *The Outlines of Educational Psychology*, p. 178.

nature. It is important that early training make the individual a person of prompt action as soon as the nature of the situation is perceived. It is only to such a person that ideals and forms of action can be of any value." "Hudson¹² says: "*This is true education: to define and strengthen desires worth while; and to teach the sure means of their fulfillment.*" In the process it discourages interests not worth while. Education is the teaching of right wants and how to get them? Such education combines efficiently the seemingly contradictory values of initiative and discipline; the student shall be led to discipline himself through the wants which, by initial encouragement from without, he at length recognizes as his very own. The student is in a measure of bondage so that eventually he may be truly free." Our attempt here is not to bring forth a set of the opinions of educators, but merely to indicate present thought on the meaning of education. To-day the matter of desires and attitudes is being stressed. Perhaps one reason for this is because there are also many who stress the utilitarian conception of school life, that is, that the chief business of the school is to prepare people for earning a living. But there ought to be no difference of opinion regarding moral character; for is not one's moral conduct as practical and therefore as useful as his ability to earn money? And furthermore, one's moral character determines largely how he will spend the money he earns. In case of gross moral irregularity, it may be that sheer ability or efficiency will be of little avail; for if the individual lacks sufficient character to live properly with his fellows, society may feel that he must be isolated. Only shortsightedness leads the utilitarian to ignore the value of morality in education.

Education represents the growth of the individual toward certain ends. It does not take place in the home or the school-room or on the playground, but it takes place within the individual through his experiences in the home, the school, the playground, and everywhere else. Education implies increased power, skill, efficiency, knowledge—all these. But more and more we are demanding that education must also mean that the individual's power, skill, efficiency, and knowledge shall be used for the good of his associates, his city, his nation, his generation. In fact, he must be conscious of future generations and must live in a certain manner because he grants rights and privileges to those who are to live after he has run his course. So we set aside forest reserves, we conserve the soil, we make treaties with other nations under the influence of the conviction that no man liveth to himself, and that even one generation must live so that life will be richer for the generation which is to follow.

To this end, it is important that the educational system be conscious at all times of the broad scope of its undertaking. As Dewey¹³ says, "to the educator for whom the problems of democracy are at all real, the vital necessity appears to be that of making the connection between the child and his environment as complete and intelligent as possible, both for the welfare of the child and for the sake of the community. The way this is to be accomplished will, of course, vary according to the conditions of the community, and to a certain extent according to the temperament and beliefs of the educator." While it is not fair to Professor Dewey to find fault with his conception from such a meager bit of his argument, it is nevertheless noteworthy that he does not feel that the nature of the individual will have any part in the

12. Hudson, J. W., *The College and New America*, p. 110.

13. Dewey, John, *Schools of Tomorrow*, p. 289.

variability of the educational method. Recent psychological findings point rather clearly to the fact that one of the first steps in the process of education is to find out what each candidate for education has the ability to accomplish. Elsewhere Dewey¹⁴ recognizes this principle, though he speaks of it under the discussion of interest. He argues that most educators now agree that it is unwise to force the child to carry on work which does not appeal to him or interest him. Here again, however, he fails to see that interest is probably so closely associated with individual ability that no study of "interest" which does not start with specific abilities will be of much value. After all, the child as he matures into a man or woman is the proper measure of education. Subject matter is important only because it influences and changes the child. But the influences of the home and the school must extend far beyond the time when the child leaves them, for the child needs ideals, habits, adequate goals, and worthy ambitions as long as he lives. The final test of education, therefore, is not the child, but the adult. How did the home and the school and other institutions help him to become a fine man, or wherein did they fail? At any rate it is evident that morality and education are so closely interwoven that they cannot be disassociated. Psychology can conceive of no good man apart from a man who does acts which are good. Likewise, education has failed if it has informed without having to some degree changed the individual into a better person.

MORAL INSTRUCTION. But how can we secure the desired moral character in people? The most obvious answer is that we can do this through moral instruction. We can teach the child how to be good, or rather how to become good, by telling him what goodness consists of, and by teaching him to approve of goodness and to hate evil. With this idea in mind, many attempts have been made to teach regular courses in morals along with the other school studies. In Great Britain and some of the continental countries formal moral instruction has been tried for a number of years. Mr. M. E. Sadler* in his two-volume work on *Moral Instruction and Training in Schools* has gathered together much valuable data regarding the successes and weaknesses of this plan. Sadler's work is especially valuable in that much of the material is from those who actually taught the courses or observed the actions of the pupils. While there is enough evidence in the reports of those who have dealt with formal instruction in morals to show that the system cannot be condemned *in toto*, there still remain the age long objections to instruction in morals. From the standpoint of psychology, instruction in morals is justifiable, provided it meets certain requirements. Its value in general lies in the fact that it seeks to make conduct rational. If the child understands why it is desirable for him to act in a certain manner, he will frequently do so. There is much evidence to show that one of the greatest weaknesses in the training and education of children at the present time is that they are told and taught too much that is inadequately explained. After several years of this experience, it is no wonder that they pay little attention to the educational system as a whole. Of course, rationalizing the conduct of the child will not insure that he will always act in a desirable manner; but it will in many cases do away with infractions of the rules of the group which formerly have seemed to him meaningless and therefore unreasonable. And whatever seems unnecessary, trivial, and superimposed

14. Dewey, John, *Schools of Tomorrow*, p. 299.

*(For some of the significant statements in this work see appendix I at the end of this chapter.)

to the child does not get his respect. Only a sense of fear or duty makes him respond to such rules or opinions. One of the functions of instruction in morals is to lay some reasonable foundation for action. For example, the child is taught that he ought to be honest. But why? Moral instruction should take whatever time and pains are necessary to see that every child in a given system understands exactly why honesty is desirable and why dishonesty is undesirable. That much of our teaching has not been rationally understood is evidenced by certain experiments carried on with university students. The writer has examined more than four hundred of them in respect to giving rational reasons for the ten commandments. Only a few are able to give any reasonable explanation of them at all. The same students were asked to give a rational explanation of certain rules on the campus of their own institution, and they did but little better.* There seems to be no sensible reason why somewhere along the child's educational course he is not led to face the reasons for the conduct which society expects of him. The course need not be called "moral instruction" or "moral education." It may properly be given as a part of some existing course. Seemingly what actually happens in our modern school system is that each teacher in turn takes it for granted that the child understands the moral requirements which society makes of him. After a while such carelessness produces a set of teachers who themselves do not know clearly and definitely why certain actions are called harmful and vicious. This leads to the very questionable practice, which is now prevalent, of teaching the boy at home, at church, and at school that he "must not" do certain things without showing him exactly why these things have been condemned by parents, teachers, and society at large. One of the chief contributions of sociology is that it has explained many traditional standards of conduct.

According to Partridge¹⁵ "we need two concrete courses in morals, one for the high school; another for the first years of college, and for these material is now available in the new departments of ethics, sociology, and psychology. The need of the youth is to study types of virtue rather than types of ethical theory. He must see the elementary virtues embodied and portrayed in types of human character. Teaching what is purely moral must often be suppressed, but the moral intention should always be uppermost." Weigle¹⁶ thinks that "moral training must go along with moral instruction. What we tell a child about right and wrong has beyond question a great deal to do with his moral development. He has constant need of instruction, 'precept upon precept, line upon line.' But he is all the time working over his experience into laws and ideas of his own; and these determine the attitude he takes toward our teaching and the way he understands it. Parents and teachers should manage the conditions of his life so that the laws which grow from the natural roots of which we have been thinking may illumine and enforce their instruction, rather than contradict and weaken it. When there is conflict, the precept generally loses out and the law from life abides." There can be no doubt that moral instruction is necessary. The race has always used and benefitted by it. In modern complex social life, however, moral training is being neglected in the home. The school is becoming responsible for it. Therefore, it is necessary for the school system to formulate some plan whereby moral instruction can be given and moral training secured.

*(See appendix II at close of this chapter).

15. Partridge, G. E., *Genetic Philosophy of Education*, p. 174.

16. Weigle, Luther A., *The Pupil and the Teacher*, p. 92.

CONTENT OF MORAL INSTRUCTION

Chapter II

WHAT SHALL BE TAUGHT? It is one thing to say that moral instruction is desirable and quite a different thing to say how we shall teach morals. In the main, there are two or three possibilities. (1) We may have a course in morals added to the present curriculum, taught either by one of the regular staff, or by a clergyman, or someone else from the outside; or (2) we may include the content of the course in morals under some course already given, that is, we may teach the content of moral instruction under civics; or (3) we may teach morals by requiring each teacher to interpret all the school studies in such a way that moral instruction becomes a part of the interpretation of all the school studies and activities. Added to this conception is the desirable practice of having each teacher emphasize neatness, exactness, quietness, and many other virtues as a part of the moral training which the school system can give without even so much as calling it by name. There are other possibilities, but the three mentioned have in them the broad principles underlying all other schemes.

However, our interest at present is not in method, but in content. What shall be the nature of moral instruction? Griggs¹⁷ says, "The first requisite in regard to the conception of character is that it should be essentially positive. The mere avoidance of evil is one condition of a good life, but it is only a condition, and when it is fulfilled, the question remains open as to the worth of the life in either happiness or human service. We want, not that a man should refrain from harming his neighbors, but that he should love their welfare, enter sympathetically into their lives and seek to help them grow toward their highest aims; not that he should avoid falsehood, but that he should love and strive for the truth. So we need to foster the development of positive insight, cosmopolitan sympathy, generous instincts of service, an heroic attitude toward difficulties." Few will object to this statement, but how shall we secure it? Partridge¹⁸ quotes G. Stanley Hall as follows: "Moral education, therefore, cannot be compressed into a single formula, as though it were a training of some one emotion or habit. It must touch life at all points, recognizing that its work is to train a great force, which, as enthusiasm, can be turned into many different channels. Every institution must take part in this effort. Besides the school we need many other agencies. We need a reformed theater. We need gymnasia, holding up high ideals of physical perfection. Opportunity for an abundance of wholesome social life must be provided. The church must perform a more active part in moral control, and become more practical. We need, indeed, a synthesis of all the agencies which make for moral welfare, knowing that the problem is nothing less than that of conserving the most precious of our resources—the moral enthusiasm of the young." If we think of morality from the standpoint of citizenship, we may ask what kind of citizen we desire, and then we may ask what principles of moral training this conception would demand. Johnson¹⁹ says that "citizenship should carry with it other obligations than the mere payment of taxes and willingness, if need be, to bear arms in the country's defense. A good citizen will think less of the rights than he does of the responsibilities

17. Griggs, Edward Howard, *Moral Education*, p. 56.

18. Partridge, G. E., *Genetic Philosophy of Education* pp. 167-68.

19. Johnson, Franklin Winslow, *The Problems of Boyhood*, pp. 95-6.

which citizenship involves. Casting a ballot is no more a privilege than it is an obligation." If we think of morality from the viewpoint of democracy, we again may ask what will be required. Winchester²⁰ thinks that "real democracy rests upon two great correlative principles, each of which is fully recognized and generally accepted: first, the right of every individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, without encroachment thereupon by any other individual; and, secondly, the duty of the individual not only to respect this right of every other, but also to join with all others in the whole-hearted endeavor to secure, for all, those blessings which are the fruit of co-operative effort, and can be secured only by such effort. Over-emphasis upon the first principle leads to individualism or to the exploitation of society by one or a few of its members, while over-emphasis upon the second principle leads to socialism, the logic of which tends toward the subordination of the individual to society as a whole, and the possible restriction of individual initiative. Somehow the balance between these two extremes of democracy must be maintained in the administration of the commonwealth."

Perhaps we can summarize as follows: what we need in moral instruction is a body of doctrine which will set before the child two great principles: first, that he must make the most of his own abilities, and that to this end he must set himself at the task of discovering what his abilities are and how he may develop them; second, this body of doctrine must put before the child the peculiar relationship he bears to all other members of society and must help him to understand that he is not an isolated member, but an integral part of the larger social group. Therefore, he must think of society as having great possibilities of development, even as he has as an individual. He must put himself to the task of helping society reach that acme of development which her abilities suggest is possible. This body of doctrine may, as we have said, be taught in a course, or it may merely exist in the minds of the teachers as one of the goals of education. At any cost, it must not be considered extra luggage which the child must carry through his educational journey. Nor must we think of the school as the only agency through which this moral instruction is to be given. The home, the church—all institutions of the child's environment such as banks and business corporations must take upon themselves the responsibility of interpreting to the child these two fundamental concepts of character.

MORALITY AND RELIGION. In a broad sense, the field of religious interest is the field of life itself, either of the individual or of the race. Most religions undertake to go back to the beginnings of the race, if not beyond, in order to show that some attempt has been made to harmonize all the experiences of humanity. More specifically, however, religion concerns itself with some conception of deity, with the relation of deity to the universe and to man. Usually religion has some opinion of the relation of man to man. While it is difficult to divorce these three interests, the third aspect of religion is the one which is most vital because it is the expression of whatever thought has preceded it. It is the expression of one's own attitude toward his fellow-men because of his religious views. It is what Saint James called "pure religion." So far as morality and religion are concerned, religion may be a great force in making men moral. This may be done first by establishing certain moral principles which become more or less obligatory upon the individual because he is taught that

20. Winchester, Benjamin S., *Religious Education and Democracy*, p. 22.

deity requires them. This is another way of saying that moral principles belong to the universal nature of things and that the individual disregards them at his own peril. Or the tenets of religion may be interpreted so that one can only please deity, that is, come in harmony with the universal plan of things, by helping his fellow-men. Helpfulness is the expression of a man's love for others. He loves them because they are precious in the universal scheme of things and because they, like him, need help in order to have success and happiness. When religion succeeds in interpreting life thus, or in giving to a considerable number of individuals this philosophy, it becomes a powerful ally of morality and lays the foundation for what we often refer to as social righteousness. Men must believe in the worth of each other before they can be united for great purposes which lie in part or wholly beyond their own selfish interests. It is thus that religion may play a great part as a means for social control.

There are many other aspects of religion which may create fear in the hearts of men. Deity may be explained to them as a kind of Super-man who has control of nature and of man's destiny in a supernatural and mysterious sense. To displease him is to provoke his wrath, and to provoke his wrath is to bring upon one's self sure destruction. Therefore, one must live according to set rules and requirements which deity has arbitrarily laid down. If one err at all from these set standards it is dangerous. Yet deity is merciful as well as just and will forgive some degree of laxity so long as the general trend of a man's life shows that his sincere purpose is to do the will of deity. The world over, this is the most popular conception of religion. It influences the moral actions and decisions of men because they are fearful. When the requirements of deity are humanitarian, as in the Christian religion, morality, both individual and social, has great support. Oftentimes, however, the requirements of deity seem to make men individualistic. Men try to please deity and forget each other. Some believe that to have bargained successfully with God is the essence of salvation. Such a view of religion is, of course, anti-social.

But it must be remembered that religion is always interpreted through some institution such as the church. It often happens that the church emphasizes the original creedal statements of religion but slightly, and seeks to emphasize right conduct. It may teach that the will of deity is that all men should live as brothers. When this is the case, the church becomes a potent means of influencing public morals. Betts²¹ says that the aims of religious education should be: (1) "*Fruitful knowledge*; knowledge of religious truths that can be set at work in the daily life of the child now and in the years that lie ahead. (2) *Right attitudes*; the religious warmth, responsiveness, interests, ideals, loyalties, and enthusiasm which lead to action and to a true sense of what is most worth while. (3) *Skill in living*; the power and will to use the religious knowledge and enthusiasm supplied by education in shaping the acts and conduct of the daily life." Such an aim for religious education means that the chief interest of the church, as the interpreter of religion, is right social conduct.

But perhaps the greatest influence religion has upon morality is in the idealism which it furnishes to religious people, and through them to the whole of society. Religion posits great possibilities for humanity. Sin can be con-

21. Betts, G. H., *How to Teach Religion*, p. 47.

quered. A golden age dawns already to the spiritually-minded. Service is the way to distinction in the Kingdom of God. It is even doubtful if such high aims can be found outside of the religious field. As Ellwood²² points out, "Science has discovered no substitute for religion as a spring of social idealism. Religion, therefore, must continue to furnish the aspiration, the motive, for the realization of ideal social ends; but science must draw the plans and furnish the means. Obviously, the religious spirit cannot work intelligently and beneficently in human affairs unless it uses to the full the established knowledge which science offers to mankind." Not the least part of the idealism which Christianity offers is the essential unity of the human race. There is one God, there is one humanity, there should be one brotherhood. Upon such ideas as these it is possible to create attitudes of sympathy and fellowship which break down the walls of partition between Jew and Gentile, between white and yellow. Religion presents to the ordinary man a kind of World Scheme.²³ Man is not detached from the world plan, but a part of it. As he faces the future he is to become increasingly a part of an Infinite Plan. Religion, then, may contribute certain vital influences to the control of human conduct, and any scheme for improving morality ought to seek whatever religion has to offer.

MORALITY AS SEEN IN THE INDIVIDUAL AND IN SOCIETY. It will be helpful now to attempt to portray a moral individual. What is he? How shall we know him? How does he differ from others? Perhaps one of the best pictures that has ever been drawn of such a person is that by Charles F. Thwing.²⁴ "He has clearness of thought without coldness, affection without softness, strength without harshness, a giant's vigor without a giant's cruelty, a sense of beauty without effusiveness, individuality without eccentricity, and a great sympathy without commonplaceness. He is wise without being pedantic, sincere without pride or vanity, comprehensive without neglecting the detail, guided and inspired by high-reaching and deep-lying principles without neglecting the nearest duty, patient without sluggishness nor slackness, considerate in both feeling and mind, magnanimous with an instinct for freedom, but recognizing the divine and human laws, never allowing courtesy to hide the reality of things, nor the reality of things underlying to be a substitute for courtesy. Social and yet reverent, controlling self and therefore controlling and persuasive of others. An opportunist, yet with an eye and an ear to the universal and the eternal, tolerant toward others, but severe toward himself, having a life and character filled with life's great unities, and yet adjusting himself to daily needs and hourly duties, inspired by life's ideals, yet taking hold with firm grip of life's present real problems—such is the educated man." This is, according to Dr. Thwing, a picture of the educated man. But it is also a picture of a good man, a man who is the product of moral training, whether he has had courses in morals and ethics or not. Horne²⁵ believes that "The educated man is happy. Happiness consists in the possession and use of one's full powers. He knows the truth, and the truth has made him free. He feels the beautiful, and the beautiful has made him gentle. He wills the good, and the good has made him strong."

22. Ellwood, C. A., *Christianity and Social Science*, p. 11.

23. Millikan, Robert A., *A scientist Confesses His Faith*, Popular Religion Leaflets, Science and Religion Series, pp. 28-30

24. Thwing, Charles Franklin, *Education According to Some Modern Masters*, pp. 291-2.

25. Horne, Herman Harrell, *The Philosophy of Education*, p. 240.

Moral education when perfected in the individual has secured those creative and self-developing virtues which ought properly to be understood by the term "culture." The individual has made the most of himself. He has become, so far as his abilities make it possible, an ideal man. He is the best he can be. In addition to this, the morally trained individual, since he understands and appreciates relative values, finds the highest expression of his powers in the service of others. This service may be direct, as the individual comes into personal contact with men, helping them always to live a better and richer life; or it may be indirect, as when the individual devotes himself to some great task that will eventually bless humanity. The scientist, for example, isolates himself from humanity in order that eventually he may give to society that which supplies a long felt need. In other words, the good individual is socialized. He lives not unto himself, but for the good of all. His individual characteristics and attainments are not devoted selfishly to outstripping his fellow-men; they are devoted rather to helping others altruistically. This type of man is not the product of the imaginative dreamer; he has often lived in flesh and blood. Much of what we call good in the world to-day has been left by him as a heritage. It is not because he is new to the world and needs an introduction that we mention him; but rather because we would emphasize that the world needs more like him—thousands like him—instead of the paltry few society is now producing.

Morality also manifests itself in society through institutional life. The peculiar bent that morality gives to all social institutions is that they exist for the welfare of the many rather than for the benefit of the few. Morality does not necessarily produce democratic forms of institutional life, but it does tend to develop the democratic spirit or attitude. Morality manifests itself in particular through institutions by causing people to be beneficently inclined. Beneficence is manifested in many ways. It influences all the actions of the group in such a manner that those who seem to merit the least, often receive much attention. For example, morality may manifest itself in a society by the way in which the criminal is treated and upon the genuine sorrow of society because one of its members has temporarily fallen. If it is the hope of society that he will soon be restored, and if the sick and poor and the needy are all cared for because men are beneficent, social morality is thus manifested. But this does not mean that justice is ruled out, or that tenderness makes the social structure weak, depriving it of its lasting qualities. For the spirit of helpfulness and forgiveness binds men together and thus creates social strength. It calls forth the best from the individual and thus is positively reformative. It helps men to look far into the future and enables them to plan wisely for their children's children.

PSYCHOLOGY AND MORAL TRAINING. If we define Psychology in the simplest possible words, we may say that it is the science of human nature and conduct. It deals with the problems of human thought and human action. Of course, there is an animal psychology, but for the most part Psychology limits itself more particularly to those matters which concern the education of human beings. For example, it concerns itself with the nature of learning. It also deals with all the processes involved in habit formation, memory, and thinking. Aside from such major interests, it may concern itself with such problems as individual differences, or with specific abilities. The distinctive field of Educational Psychology, then, is that it aims to throw light upon and

ventually to solve those problems of education whose solution depends upon an understanding of the nature of the child, or upon the nature of persons in general.

It is obvious that Psychology has much to offer those who are interested in moral education. (1) It makes possible the study of human nature by experimentation and by controlled observation. This is in sharp contrast to the former method of supposition and inference. (2) It furnishes the moral educator with information regarding the nature of learning and habit formation. It emphasizes the importance of drill, of reviews, and of study as they affect the learning process in general, and especially as they influence conduct. (3) It sets the moral educator rationally at the task of understanding what elements in human nature must be changed, and suggests how the changes may be secured. It therefore gives a rational basis for moral instruction in that it attempts to rationalize all the actions of the child. Such factors as play, work, correction, etc. are put upon a rational basis because their influence can be observed accurately and to some degree measured. (4) It gives the moral educator data regarding the certain changes in the growth of the child which have profound moral significance. It shows, for example, why we have the problems of sex with adolescents, and also throws light upon such a phenomenon as conversion or of initiation. (5) It lays down certain fundamental principles for parents and teachers regarding the understanding of the child as an individual person, and shows how to ascertain the child's relative ability to perform certain tasks. This has profound significance in that it demands that each child be thoroughly understood by some one or more persons, whereas formerly too much was taken for granted.

The psychological aspects of moral training are those aspects of moral training upon which Psychology can offer definite help. This study is an attempt to study moral training from the standpoint of certain psychological principles, rather than from the standpoint of inherited opinions regarding the control of human behavior.

SUMMARY. Men have not learned all that is to be learned about living together. They are equipped with instincts which probably served them well in primitive societies, but which must be altered in a complex social structure. Therefore, education performs the function of securing these desirable changes in the least possible time. Moral education stresses the desirable attitudes and sets goals and standards toward which human beings are to be directed.

Morality may be conceived of in two senses: what a given society approves of at a given time; or the highest life of which the individual or the group is capable of attaining. Both conceptions are useful since culture and civilization are progressive in their nature, and are constantly pressing on toward goals which are considered both desirable and possible.

Morality is attained not by heredity or by gift, but by experience. It is the product of thinking and acting. The good man is the man who does good deeds. Hence morality is not an end in itself, but it is an attitude of mind or a spirit which helps either the individual or the group to accomplish desired goals.

Public opinion, when it is rationally understood, tends to mold people's lives after a general fashion. But frequently public opinion ostensibly approves of one thing while it actually allows the opposite kind of action to flourish in its midst. This gives a kind of screen to low morals, and tends to make public opinion itself appear to be a sham. But when public opinion is thor-

oughly rational, when it is constantly correcting itself, and when it is always seeking higher levels, it becomes a safe guardian for morality.

Morality and ideals are related somewhat as pattern and garment. Ideals are life motives. They are desires, either individual or social, for which one is willing to strive and sacrifice. If these ideals are good, morality becomes more or less a matter of course. If these ideals are bad, actions become immoral. Livingstone represents one kind of ideals and morality. Napoleon Bonaparte another. The function of the educator is to help the youth choose those ideals which will demand that he practice all the higher individual and social virtues.

Morality and Progress are related in that progress depends upon change and development; and the way in which a society or individual may change depends somewhat upon the moral habits involved. Moral men tend to be sympathetic and of a kindly nature. Such attitudes unify men, thus creating social solidarity. Progress may be thought of as the end of morality. Men and groups are moral or good for a purpose, and that purpose is progress.

Morality and Education are also two related interests. The two terms are really parts or shades of a larger interest. The chief interest may be the welfare and progress of society and its members. Education seeks to contribute toward this welfare and progress by instructing, informing and training men so that their development may be complete. Hence morality is a subordinate aim of education. Education, whether achieved through the school, the home, or the total experiences of life seeks to produce a good man—if not the best, at least not the worst. Even if it did nothing more than establish such simple habits as carefulness and politeness it would be contributing toward moral ends. Most of all, education sets high aims and worthy motives before the youth, and these tend to call forth worthy deeds.

Moral instruction should concern itself with the controlling of behavior. The chief functions of moral instruction are to furnish a rational basis for behavior, and to establish the individual in moral living. It does not matter much what institutions or persons educate the child so long as he is truly educated. In general, we may say that moral training seeks to show the youth why and how he is to perform moral acts. Mere theorizing is not only inadequate but may be actually harmful. The content of moral instruction should be that body of doctrine or teaching which will lead the individual to accomplish for himself his own full development, and which will also lead him to serve his fellow-men.

Morality and religion are frequently closely identified. If a religion stresses social values, it strengthens morality by giving men high ideals outside of their own individual interests. Often religion stresses man's relation to his fellow-men and thus creates social thought and interest. Religion may furnish many with certain harmonizing influences and aspirations and thus may strengthen the social fibre.*

Morality expresses itself in the individual by producing a wholesome personality in which all known capacities, socially evaluated, are developed. It shows itself in society by making such virtues as kindness and helpfulness paramount. It also seeks for social righteousness and social justice.

Psychology, which is the science of human nature and human conduct, gives the basis for a scientific study of human behavior and thus affords the moral educator with the exact means for understanding human nature and how to change and control it. It may be said, therefore, that Educational

Psychology gives necessary information for any rational scheme of moral training.

It is evident, then, that the content of moral education must not only acquaint the individual with social and personal problems of conduct. This it must do; but it must do more. There must be in moral education not only information, but training. The content of moral training, therefore, must provide situations by which the individual can secure help in solving his moral problems intelligently. Whatever else the curriculum in moral education does, it must secure for the individual an interest in looking always for the moral elements in whatever pursuit he may be engaged. The man who is educated morally is not merely "good" in general; he is "good" specifically because he sees the necessity for moral discernment in specific acts which make up his total life.

APPENDIX I—CHAPTER II

MORAL INSTRUCTION AND TRAINING IN SCHOOLS

M. E. Sadler

Two Illustrative Articles

1—Article by Miss E. P. Hughes, Vol. I, pp. 406-7. The head (principal) should have a scheme of moral topics, not for the children, but for the teachers, and the scheme should be systematically gone through. The inclusion of definite moral instruction should be made compulsory in each school. Systematic and direct moral instruction should be given as part of the religious training of the school. I have a rooted conviction that moral instruction apart from religious teaching is an edifice without a foundation. I believe in a steady, slow cumulation of small moral impressions in all the minute details of work, rather than in systematic teaching of morals. Moral instruction is a diet, and not doses. I do not believe in set lessons in morals. Children are already quite enough preached to in Wales. The loss involved in the absence of systematic moral instruction in schools: (a) The result is a divorce between two aspects of the child's growth, his intellect, and his character. The giving of definite moral teaching by his everyday teacher will tend to unify the intellectual and religious sides of him. (b) Moral instruction given by the everyday teacher will have greater weight and force than when given by a minister, or even by a parent. (c) The reflex upon the teacher in the direction of a more consistent self-control and a deeper realization of his or her responsibility. I think the basis of the highest ethics is the Sermon on the Mount, and this should be given in every form once a year. The head teaches the New Testament in every form. I do not believe in religious instruction in day schools. It is the work of the clergy and parents. In my long experience (twenty-five years) I find that the more the teacher confines himself to moral instruction only, the better it is, and the greater the influence it has on the children. I take Scripture every day, largely ethical and religious. The children of Roman Catholics and Agnostics never come to Scripture, but all unite on Friday morning for moral instruction. I think this is a very valuable link. The head has conversation lessons with each class in the school in turn, and moral points are frequently the subject of these talks. I believe that the more unconsciously girls absorb moral instruction, the more effective the result will be.

2—Article by Percival Chubb, Vol. II, p. 246. The teacher follows carefully and cautiously the lead and bent of the class, adapting the instruction to the interests and aptitudes of the particular group of pupils. In this way, by the use of the story in all its forms—myth, fable, legend, history, biography—and by guidance of discussion, the teacher seeks to build up in each class those definite conceptions of right and wrong, those ideals of excellence, which seem appropriate to the child at his particular age, and which he needs in his actual relations in his daily life.

APPENDIX 2. II

The following data were secured from students of the University of Missouri. These data were not all secured at the same time. The total number of students who responded was 420.

INSTRUCTION READ TO CLASS: The ten commandments are ten statements concerning human conduct which have had profound influence not only upon the habits of the Hebrew people, but also upon all people in Christendom. The influence of these statements has not been confined to narrow religious channels, but it has entered into the laws, public opinion, and cultural ideals of all kinds of societies from the family to the nation. It is now your task to show the reasonableness of these statements, to show why, for example, people should not kill, or commit adultery, or steal. Take each commandment and discuss why it ever seemed necessary. The answers were arbitrarily divided into three classes.

ANSWERS:

FIRST COMMANDMENT

1. God required it, 276.
2. Don't know, 110.
3. Attempt to explain monotheism, 44.

SECOND COMMANDMENT

1. God required it, 256.
2. Don't know, 71.
3. Images harmful, 52.
4. Images incompatible with monotheism, 41.

THIRD COMMANDMENT

1. God required it, 155.
2. Not right to swear, 102.
3. Don't know, 60.
4. Swearing shows disrespect, 103.

FOURTH COMMANDMENT

1. God required it, 284.
2. God rested then, 80.
3. Man needs rest, 56.

FIFTH COMMANDMENT

1. God required it, 215.
2. Good thing, 112.
3. Will make men live long, 40.
4. Family unity, 53.

SIXTH COMMANDMENT

1. God required it, 233.
2. Not just or fair, 117.
3. One should not kill, 70.

SEVENTH COMMANDMENT

1. God required it, 180.
2. Not fair, 141.
3. Injures family life, 87.
4. Might get disease, 12.

EIGHTH COMMANDMENT

1. God required it, 211.
2. Not right, 76.
3. Human life is dear, 57.
4. Anti-social, 76.

NINTH COMMANDMENT

1. God required it, 237.
2. Not right, 79.
3. Might injure others, 104.

TENTH COMMANDMENT

1. God required it, 192.
2. Might lead to worse sin, 167.
3. Makes one unhappy, 79.

The method of securing the information has been criticized. It has been suggested, for example, that the test might have been given thus:

Why should we keep the seventh commandment..

(Check in the square opposite the answer you prefer.)

- (1) Because God required it.
- (2) Because it is wrong.
- (3) Because it breaks up the family.
- (4) Because one might get disease.

But such a test is objectionable for three reasons:

- (1) the answers are suggested to the students by the examiner;
- (2) the test becomes a kind of game of guess and chance;
- (3) it limits the freedom of expression.

The data from this test are worth something. They show us that the great majority of those who answered had never gotten away from the instruction that God had arbitrarily set up rules for men to keep. They show us also that a very small per cent really got at the heart of the problem. The purpose of the test was to show why the commandments were given, that is, to show why they were reasonable and necessary. Of course, the test reveals two things which cannot be separated: that the students had not previously studied the reasons underlying the commandments; and that they sought the easiest way to answer the questions. It was easy to say "God required it." But it is also true that in society we are apt to do the same thing. Surely these data would indicate that in moral instruction too much is taken for granted. In view of the fact that so few of the students in the school system go beyond the sixth grade, it is necessary that before that time some attempt be made to rationalize all the moral precepts the child has had previously. Perhaps the best way to make this attempt would be through some course in civics. There is no reason why the fundamental reasons lying back of the law and public opinion might not be pointed out there. Too often courses in civics have dwelt on the machinery of the organization of society to the exclusion of the basic principles of social harmony.

THE LAWS OF LEARNING APPLIED TO MORAL EDUCATION:

Chapter III

UNITY OF THE LEARNING PROCESS. The parent and the teacher must proceed on the assumption that the same laws which apply to learning in general apply to all learning and doing in the field of morality. Since morality is not something extra added to life, but a manner of living, it follows that moral education proceeds along the same lines as all other education. Moral education is but a phase of education in general. It is not within the scope of this study to discuss the nature of learning. For a discussion of the nature of learning, and the processes involved in the formation of bonds between responses and stimuli we need only to refer to such works on Educational Psychology as are listed in the bibliography. Our aim is to inquire how the findings of educational psychology can be used in the process of influencing children for given moral ends. We shall outline a few of the more fundamental principles of learning that we may discuss their application to moral problems the more intelligently.

SOME IMPORTANT LAWS OF LEARNING.² (1) *The law of exercise, with its positive and negative aspects.* The simple fact of this law is that the more often a certain stimulus and certain response are coupled, the greater is the possibility that they will be coupled in the future. The connection between a given stimulus and response is "strengthened," that is, it is made immensely more probable that the same stimulus will be followed by the same response upon repetition. Having once learned that the product of 7 times 7 is 49, and having repeated this for a number of times, and having never heard that 7 times 7 is any other number, the tendency will be always to say "49" if the question "7 times 7 equals what" is asked. On the contrary, if one learns that 7 times 7 equals 49, but does not repeat it, after a lapse of time there will be a stronger tendency to connect 49 with 7 times 7 than to connect sixty-four or seventy-three with the same combination. Thorndike³ calls the strengthening of the bonds by repetition the *law of use*, and the law of allowing the connection to become weak through lack of repetition the *law of disuse*. Pyle⁴ shows how these connections tend to become "stronger" or "weaker" by pointing out that the "preferential routes" in the nervous system offer much or little resistance according to the law of repetition; and perhaps to other laws. But no psychologist interprets this law in a hard and fixed way. The routes are not "hard surfaced." One cannot be absolutely sure that the original connection, even after much repetition, will always offer the least resistance to the stimulus at a given moment. Therefore there are times when our mental machinery seems to "slip a cog" as when, under certain circumstances we cannot call the name of a friend or when we do not remember our telephone number.

(2) *A second law of learning is what Thorndike⁵ calls the law of effect.* The fact of this law is that when a certain response follows a certain stimulus, if the resultant state of mind is satisfying or pleasing, there is a tendency to

1. For this whole topic, I am indebted perhaps more than the references show, to Dr. W. H. Pyle, and to Dr. E. L. Thorndike

2. Without further reference these principles will be more or less taken for granted throughout the entire discussion.

3. Thorndike, E. L., *Educational Psychology, Briefer Course*, p. 70.

4. Pyle, W. H., *Psychology of Learning*, p. 5.

5. Thorndike, op. Cit. p. 71.

make this bond again. On the other hand, if a certain stimulus is followed by a certain response with resultant dissatisfaction and pain, there is the tendency to escape from making this response again.

These two laws alone are of the utmost significance in moral education. They may be thought of as twin laws, that is, they may be used together. If so, then in all moral learning we have: (a) the tendency for connections to become stronger through exercise and satisfying consequences; (b) the tendency for connections to grow weaker through lack of exercise and painful or annoying consequences. When we realize that it is possible to manipulate the learner's environment in such a way that the consequences of certain responses are satisfying, as when he receives praise, and also that the consequences of certain other responses are painful, as when the learner receives punishment, the moral implications of these two laws alone are far-reaching.

In addition to these "twin laws" there are other principles of learning which are helpful in securing moral responses.

(3) *There is a definite time element in habit formation.* Under certain circumstances too much concentration does little good, and may even be harmful. Rest periods between times of practice are beneficial. This law seems to have special efficacy in cases where the learning is not readily understood or mastered.

(4) *The longer one works at a given task, the slower the rate of improvement.* That is, improvement is more rapid at first and then becomes less rapid as time goes on. This fact may throw much light upon many moral problems because fatigue, discouragement, monotony, and other factors have to be dealt with constantly.

(5) *Favorable attitudes tend to accelerate learning; hostile attitudes tend to retard learning.* This is, perhaps, only a phase of attention. In the case of favorable attitudes we may suppose that we secure "full attention," while in the case of hostile attitudes only partial attention is possible.

(6) *Understanding the purpose of learning facilitates the learning.* That is, if one knows why he is to learn a certain lesson, the learning seems to be done with less exertion. Again, this is closely akin to the matter of attitude. Certainly it is wise always to make the fullest possible explanation of moral issues.

(7) *By the law of association, whatever things are experienced together in perception tend to remain associated together in subsequent ideas.* This law has special application to the problem of rewards and punishments. If praise is always associated with certain acts in experience, and if pain is always associated with certain other acts in experience, certain habits will probably be formed because of the pleasurable associations; and desires to do certain things will be inhibited.

(8) *Through imitation, with subsequent practice, we learn to gain mastery over our environment.* In other words, an isolated person could only learn a small part of what he is able to learn in company with his fellows, specially in company with those who know more than he knows. This law applies as well to ideas and ideals as to actions.

(9) *Rivalry or competition tends to accelerate learning,* probably by helping the individual to secure a high degree of concentration. One may even compete with his own record, as, a runner may run "against time" with almost the same stimulating effect as if he is competing with another person.

(10) *Recognition of the learner's instinctive nature, using all the original impulses possible, tends to put all learning in the realm of play and thus makes it easy because the whole self is spent in the performance.* That is, if such ten-

dencies as roving, collecting, constructing, and others are utilized, all learning (or work) tends to be permeated with the spirit of play. Duty is thus forgotten and privilege is recognized.

With these principles of learning in mind, moral education can proceed just as education in history or mathematics. The process in both cases will be alike in the fundamentals. (1) There will be first a definite goal established. We shall want to know what aim we have in moral education. As soon as this is known, then we shall proceed to apply the principles of learning until the goal is reached.

Suppose, for example, that honesty is a goal. We shall then proceed to apply the principles of learning. What principles shall be applied must be ascertained by the teacher or parent. First of all, perhaps, we should use the principle of praise and punishment. That is, for every honest deed we should apply praise and for every dishonest deed we should apply punishment. Perhaps next we should apply the principle of use and disuse. We should bring repetition into play by increasing situations in which honesty or dishonesty are possible. By repetition of situations where the response is "honesty" we can strengthen the "honesty" bonds. In like manner, every time there has been a situation presented to the learner in which he might have been dishonest and he was not, the supposition is that through the law of disuse, that is, neglect, the tendency to make such bonds—if they were ever made—becomes weaker and weaker. Perhaps a third principle to apply in securing honesty is that of the time element. It may be that the child is in the "exaggerating" stage when he pictures every thought in extravagant statements which are clearly beyond reason. The parent will, of course, correct him. But the wise parent will not try to eradicate the tendency to exaggerate immediately. Repetition of the idea "I must not exaggerate" must go on for days and weeks before the idea of exact truthfulness takes its place. Another principle which might be applied to the problem of honesty is that of imitation. If the child always hears truthful, exact, definite answers, he will tend to frame the same kind of answers. Thus we might go on until in some way or other we could make definite application of many of the principles of learning to the matter of securing "honesty" responses. It is almost certain that we should apply the principle of helping the learner to understand the desirability of honesty. Almost all persons who have tried the "case" method in reformation work find that this principle is fundamental. If John can see the injury which dishonesty may bring to others, especially to those whom he loves, as well as to himself, he seems to learn more readily the habit of honesty, or else learns the more readily to inhibit dishonesty. In either case the desired result is obtained.

Of course, what we have said of honesty applies to all the virtues. First we can arrange situations which secure "practice" so that several times in a given day the same moral issue may be brought before the child. Then we can apply one or more of the principles of learning until a sufficient amount of learning has been done for that particular day. Repetition of such performances day after day, month after month, year after year, will unquestionably produce a character of considerable stability by the age of seventeen or eighteen years.

MAKING ALLOWANCE FOR INDIVIDUAL GROWTH. Learning always signifies that change has taken place. Therefore when we deal with a child we are never dealing with a static personality, but with one which changes constantly. The significance of this fact in moral education is great. The fact that the child

is always changing means that if one is to know him he must constantly inform himself about the particular changes which are being wrought in the child's life.

(a) This may be done by understanding the general laws of development. One may know what to expect of ten-year old boys in general. He may then take it for granted that a given boy is like them. He may think of a given boy as being "typical" or "average" for a certain age. Suppose we take a boy at the age of five and attempt to follow his growth until he reaches the age of twenty-one. We may be helped if we study books which show the general characteristics of boys at five, six, seven, etc., until we have followed our boy to manhood. At any given period, we can explain many of his actions and interests by saying "that is characteristic for his age," "all boys his age are like that," etc. Obviously, however, this method of procedure is insufficient. While we may speak of ten-year-old boys in general, we may not know very much about John who is now ten years old. John has individuality. He is not the same boy at ten that his brother Will, who is twelve years old, was two years ago. John and Will simply have not developed in the same chronological order. Furthermore, the two boys may differ temperamentally so that we can recognize only a few of the "general" traits of ten-year-old boys in John that were seen in Will. The same tendencies to wrong behavior have not manifested themselves in both boys in the same manner nor at the same age.

(b) We may use the comparative method. Not only may we study the characteristics of ten-year-old boys in general, but we may study John as an individual and then compare him with others of his age. This will show us our specific problem with John.

(c) We may proceed by keeping in mind two important facts concerning individual growth. (1) The instincts do not reach maturity at the same age in all individuals. In some individuals the "ripening" of one or more instincts comes earlier than in others. Parents ought to be aware of such a possibility. They must not jump at the conclusion that the child who shows "remarkable" ability in one or two simple matters is a genius and "show him off" until he is spoiled. On the other hand, they should not suppose that the "backward" child is doomed to a life of mediocrity. If we knew enough about such cases, we should probably find that the child who thinks most logically and rationally, even though he is "backward," is the likely candidate for a place in the list of geniuses. The child who is "so brilliant" may only be precocious in a minor ability which has little lasting significance. More especially, however, this fact throws light upon questions of behavior. If the collecting instinct appears very young, we must not suppose we have a young thief. If the sex instinct ripens prematurely, we must not suppose we have a "vicious case." Both situations may be normal for the particular individual, though abnormal for the age group to which he belongs. (2) Many instinctive interests are transitory. Therefore we must deal with them *when they appear*. When the boy wants to rove, to collect, to hunt, to be out of doors, he ought to have this opportunity. Otherwise, he may tend to live a sedentary, inactive life. Because of this same fact, we may confidently expect that the boy who "collects" everything he gets his hands on will not grow "worse and worse." Such an interest may be more or less transitory. In a few years he may present no problem at all of "taking things." Furthermore, if he is properly guided and encouraged, he may become a scientist, a collector of valuable information.

Four facts, then, are evident from what we have said about individual

growth. (1) That the premature appearance of such an instinct as the collecting instinct ought to be watched carefully. The child should not be regarded as being bad merely because he takes things. On the other hand, he is a case for careful treatment and if he is neglected he may acquire bad habits. Nor should the child who is prematurely developed in a given activity be praised too highly and made to feel his superiority. In a few years, when his abilities are compared with those of other boys, he may find that his former superiority has become "inferior" because the other boys have outstripped him. (2) Since learning necessitates mental changes, one must study the individual child from time to time to ascertain what changes are taking place. Suppose, for example, that John has a rather definite conception of dishonesty at the age of seven. And suppose also that he plays with boys somewhat older who justify dishonesty under certain circumstances. It is quite natural that John's conception of dishonesty will suffer changes as a result of his new learning. What has he learned? He has learned that some boys do not regard some forms of dishonesty as being wrong. It may be that John's own conception is changed. Therefore, one cannot be sure that the conception of dishonesty which John had when he was seven years old is the one he holds when he is nine. This principle obtains in the whole realm of moral conceptions. Learning always implies changes, and one should make sure that, in the moral realm, these changes are for the better. At any rate, one can hardly take it for granted that all change due to learning is for the better. (3) It is unwise to make the actions of one child the standard for another. In the home and the school such a practice is quite common. Some allowance should be made for the difference in development between children. This does not mean that there can be no group control of children. It only means that group standards should be sufficiently plastic to make room for individual differences in development. The value of this fact in moral education is that if the child's individual status is understood, there will be little danger of judging him by standards which are beyond his reach. (4) Some children improve rapidly, others improve slowly. This is shown by many learning experiments. We may believe that in moral consciousness the same principle obtains. It may be that there are "slow" moral learners. There is every reason, however, to believe that such persons may in time reach a sufficiently high level of moral thinking and living. If their moral level is not as high as that of history's saints, it may at least be as high as the individuals themselves are capable of reaching.

SEX DIFFERENCES IN LEARNING. Thorndike⁶ thinks that the greatest difference between the sexes in their instinctive equipment is that the male is more possessed by the instinct to fight than the female, and that the female is more possessed by the nursing instinct. This theory is doubtful. There are indications that all the so-called temperamental differences between the sexes are due to the early enforcement of public opinion upon the child's behavior, dress, speech, etc., and to early occupational activities. One sex difference which seems to be well established, and which has significance in moral education, is that girls develop more rapidly than boys and that they also learn more rapidly.⁷ If we accept Thorndike's position, the moral inferences from these sex differences are: (a) Perhaps more fighting and quarreling may be expected among boys than among girls. While the goal may be to eradicate

6. Thorndike, E. L., *Psychology of Learning, Briefer Course*, p. 150.

7. Pyle, W. H. *Sex Differences and Sex Variability in Learning Capacity*. V. 14, Num. 482. School and Society.

this characteristic, too much criticism may be unwholesome. (b) If girls are more tender and loving than boys they should not be ridiculed for showing these traits. While it may be desirable to train the boy to become as tender and sympathetic as the girl, and also for the girl to become physically as aggressive as the boy, the same attainment at given ages can hardly be expected. (c) It is unreasonable to expect boys to compete with girls of the same age so far as school work is concerned. In order to estimate what a boy of ten is doing, his work must be compared with other boys his own age. If he is doing as well as girls of nine years of age, his progress is satisfactory. In behavior in general, then, we may expect the girls to "settle down" sooner than boys. The girl of sixteen may be a prim young lady, while the boy of the same age is a primitive ruffian who ignores all the rules of society. In two more years he will follow her into more serious department. (d) If girls are more tender and are not so pugnacious as boys this might explain why they seemingly respond better to institutional control such as is found in the home, the school, and the church. The "girl" problem is not usually so acute as the "boy" problem because of the ways in which the sexes respond to external authority. The boy, with his fighting instincts ever ready to assert themselves, resents anything which seems to limit his freedom. The girl, with her nursing instincts desires to avoid friction and therefore submits more readily to the will of others.

It is hardly within the scope of this study to ask why boys and girls are so different. However, it is well to point out that aside from the differences here suggested that possibly the differences between boys and girls are due to environment. Perhaps the chief factor in environment which influences sex conduct is public opinion or tradition. Girls are expected to act in a certain manner. Boys, likewise, are given certain liberties which the girls are denied. Boys can go fishing, hunting, swimming, skating, etc. and some writers have argued that their desire to do such things is due to the male instinct. In recent years the interest of girls in out-door life would make such a theory questionable if not untenable. There is no reason to believe that the instinctive hunting, roving, and collecting tendencies are not present in both sexes. If, then, girls seem to be better morally than boys, it is due largely to the fact that more is expected of them. If boys were expected not to use tobacco, not to gamble, not to commit fornication, there is no known reason why they would not respond as well as the girls. In all probability the best way to improve the moral character of boys in general is to expect more of them. There is no reason for a "double standard" of human conduct. Conceivably the boy may oppose social demands harder than the girl, but that he is constituted by nature so that he can not respond to the same moral standard as the girl is untenable in the light of present knowledge.

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES. Teachers and parents need to know that they cannot make the same finished product out of every individual. They may lead a given group of children to respond to their environment somewhat in the same manner (and this is most necessary) but the children will not be alike. This is true for the following reasons: (1) Probably no two persons have the same hereditary nature. Even twins differ in their natural abilities.¹ This is due to the fact that parents do not reproduce themselves, but pass on to their offspring a variable instinctive equipment. This fact alone is of great sig-

nificance in that it shows the danger of setting up standards which are too strict and rigid not to allow room for the play of natural differences. (2) While all individuals have the same number of instincts, they may differ in the strength, persistence and educability of these instincts. The instinct of fear is stronger in some than in others. So is the instinct of fighting and bullying. Likewise the persistence of some instincts is greater in some than in others. The roving and collecting tendencies last much longer in some boys than in others. Such tendencies are sometimes so strong that they determine a boy's vocation and career. Also some children respond more readily to education than others do. Therefore the same treatment—whether in home, or school, or society—will not produce identical effects. (3) Individuals differ according to "inner growth."⁵ If we measure two children at six years and learn their respective abilities to perform ten separate tasks, we cannot predict that at ten years of age their improvement in all ten events will be relative to the earlier records. Some children seem to mature in certain traits earlier than others. There is, therefore, a time element in education which is important. It may be that one child "outgrows" a bad habit sooner than another. But both will outgrow it in time. To pit one child against another in moral achievement may be wholesome inasmuch as it makes each do his best through the spirit of rivalry. On the other hand, constant nagging at one child because, for example, he is not as tidy as another may be unwise. It may be that the parent or teacher should continually keep the ideal of tidiness before the child and wait for time to bear the desired fruit.

Because of these three principles in individual differences, the following rules should be observed by parents.

1. Attention should be given to each child in order to discover his peculiar original nature. Then he can be guided satisfactorily toward definite moral ends.

2. If a child's original equipment has any strikingly significant characteristics, they ought to be watched and studied. If they tend toward harmful habits, they ought to be eradicated. But if they give promise of marked ability, they ought to be nourished. In this way children with special abilities—such as ability in music, art, mechanics, literature,—can be discovered early and the greatest amount of training given them while they are young and pliable. In a sense each child ought to be treated as if he were the only child in the family or the community. All of his inherent abilities should be regarded as precious.

3. Correction and punishment ought to vary according to the needs of the individual child.

4. Tests, showing the course of mental development of the child from time to time, should be given. New interests and even new aptitudes may thus be discovered and bad tendencies corrected.

5. The peculiar desires and ambitions of each child ought to be studied by the parent. To consider the child's desires and ambitions a mere hodgepodge of day-dreams is to do the child injustice. Each child's ideas and ambitions should be regarded as being fully as important to him as his eyes and ears. Out of them every child must create his own life's motives and purposes.

6. Care ought to be exercised in forcing the child to conform to common standards. As much of the child's originality as possible ought to be pre-

served and, so long as it does not lead to anti-social thought and conduct, encouraged.

7. Parents ought to talk with each child at frequent intervals when no one else is present. In this way whatever is individual or original in the child may be brought to light. If the child becomes conscious that he is not like others, he may become secretive and hide his true self. This same principle applies even more forcefully to the school room. Each teacher ought to have few enough pupils that each one may have individual attention. The proper number of pupils for each teacher can be determined only by investigation.

8. Children with special interests and abilities ought to be isolated for special investigation in order that their abilities may be trained. To refuse this and to make them conform to the training of all other children may be the poorest possible educational scheme. Perhaps, for example, it was a good thing that Lincoln had so little schooling. Under some systems his native genius might have been retarded and destroyed by a forced conformity. In every school system the children who have special ability in music, drawing, or other lines should receive special training so that it may be ascertained whether their unusual achievement is due to accelerated maturity in a special activity, or whether it is due to genuine native ability. In the latter case a long period of training should be provided.

9. Each community ought to have a trained person who is able to discover individual traits and report them to parents and teachers. Perhaps the same person could also examine the children for physical defects such as bad vision, adenoidal growths, undernourishment, etc.

10. The chief value of a knowledge of individual differences in moral training is that the parent and teacher will know when to praise and encourage and when to scold and discourage. Without some consideration of individual differences much moral instruction may actually defeat its purpose because it is not suited to the temporary needs and desires of the child.

HOW TO TEACH THE DESIRABLE VIRTUES

Chapter IV

There are two ways to find out what the desirable virtues are: to decide arbitrarily what characteristics one needs in order to become a helpful member of society; and to have persons list those virtues which they believe to be essential. The following lists were secured in the latter manner and certainly throw some light upon what virtues men commonly regard as desirable. The first list is the product of a class of 121 university students who made a list of the virtues they felt were most desirable. These lists were then summarized and the following lists are the results of the summary. The second list was made from a tabulation of the opinions of adults. It differs from the list made out by students, but not significantly. The third list of virtues is the result of the opinions of women as to what kind of man the grocer should be.¹

One can not be sure that people know what virtues are best. On the other hand such lists so nearly harmonize with the opinions of students of human nature that they may be taken as indicative of what men believe they ought to be. Religionists, sociologists, jurists, teachers, moralists, and the common masses all agree pretty well that such characteristics are desirable. The fact that men so universally know what is good is perplexing. Why, if men know what is right, do they not live accordingly? A possible answer is that they do try to live out such virtues. Perhaps a more adequate answer is that they do not feel a personal obligation for the presence of these virtues in the body politic. If this is true, then any scheme of education which emphasizes the need and importance of such virtues would be beneficial because it *would tend to make the learner conscious of his own responsibility.*

List 1

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF VIRTUES

(Numbers indicate total persons who named a given virtue.)

Altruism.....	14	Justice.....	24
Ambition.....	10	Kindness.....	21
Broad-mindedness.....	13	Industrious.....	5
Bravery.....	2	Law-abiding.....	4
Charitable.....	5	Love.....	14
Cheerful.....	4	Loyalty.....	21
Considerate.....	15	Merciful.....	1
Clean-living.....	17	Obedient.....	12
Clean-thinking.....	13	Patience.....	18
Co-operation.....	2	Persistence.....	2
Courage.....	42	Prudent.....	2
Courtesy.....	20	Pleasant.....	2
Democratic.....	5	Patriotic.....	5
Dependable.....	8	Polite.....	3
Energetic.....	4	Religious.....	25
Endurance.....	7	Respect (for others).....	17
Education.....	2	Self-control.....	29

Faith.....	10	Sincerity.....	9
Frugal.....	3	Sympathy.....	31
Fairness.....	2	Self-reliant.....	2
Faithful.....	5	Temperance.....	29
Generous.....	5	Thoughtful.....	2
Gentle.....	3	Truthful.....	45
High Ideals.....	2	Trustworthiness.....	4
Honesty.....	78	Unselfishness.....	18
Honor.....	5	Virtuous.....	4
Helpful.....	4		

List 1

LIST OF VIRTUES ACCORDING TO PREFERENCE

Honesty.....	Endurance.....	Polite
Truthfulness.....	Charitable.....	(mentioned once)
Courage.....	Democratic.....	Merciful
Sympathy.....	Faithful.....	Conscientious
Self-control.....	Generous.....	Noble
Temperance.....	Honor.....	Well-bred
Religious.....	Industrious.....	Sacredness of human life
Justice.....	Patriotic.....	
Kindness.....	Cheerful.....	Efficient
Loyalty.....	Virtuous.....	Thrifty
Courtesy.....	Helpful.....	True art
Patience.....	Law-abiding.....	Refrain from profanity
Unselfishness.....	Trustworthiness.....	Ten commandments
Clean-living.....	Gentle.....	Manners
Respect (for others).....	Bravery.....	Golden rule
Considerate.....	Cooperation	
Altruism.....	Diligent	
Love.....	Education	
Broad-mindedness.....	Fairness	
Clean-thinking.....	High ideals	
Obedient.....	Persistence	
Faith.....	Prudence	
Ambition.....	Pleasant	
Sincerity.....	Self-reliant	
Dependable.....	Thoughtful.....	
Energetic.....	Frugal	

List 2

THE FOLLOWING TABLE SHOWS WHAT 205 PERSONS THINK ARE THE DESIRABLE VIRTUES. BUSINESS MEN, HOUSEKEEPERS, LABORERS, AND MINISTERS GAVE THEIR OPINIONS

(The words describe persons rather than virtues which accounts for their adjectival form)

Six Groups Combined

- | | |
|------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Honest | 14. Friendly |
| 2. Just | 15. Cheerful |
| 3. Conscientious | 16. Open Minded |
| 4. Reliable | 17. Public Spirited |
| 5. Loyal | 18. Patient |
| 6. Kind | 19. Benevolent |
| 7. Courageous | 20. Accommodating |
| 8. Prompt | 21. Obedient |
| 9. Considerate | 22. Grateful |
| 10. Temperate | 23. Respectful |
| 11. Helpful | 24. Frank |
| 12. Forgiving | 25. Prudent |
| 13. Cleanly | |

List 3

THE FOLLOWING TABLE SHOWS WHAT VIRTUES 103 HOUSEWIVES THINK A GROCER SHOULD HAVE

- | | |
|--------------------|----------------|
| 1. Honest | 13. Kind |
| 2. Cleanly | 14. Patient |
| 3. Accommodating | 15. Helpful |
| 4. Prompt | 16. Just |
| 5. Reliable | 17. Courageous |
| 6. Conscientious | 18. Obedient |
| 7. Cheerful | 19. Openminded |
| 8. Friendly | 20. Loyal. |
| 9. Public Spirited | 21. Forgiving |
| 10. Respectful | 22. Prudent |
| 11. Considerate | 23. Benevolent |
| 12. Temperate | 24. Grateful |

CAN VIRTUES BE TAUGHT? Some say that virtues, like religion, are caught and not taught. In a sense this is true. One cannot teach simon-pure honesty. He can only teach about honesty. He can show why honesty is desirable and why dishonesty is undesirable. But one may go further than this. One may arbitrarily demand honesty of the child and attempt to have him build up attitudes and habits which beget honesty until finally the child himself desires to be honest. Under such a scheme instruction and practice should go hand in hand. As much as possible the teacher or parent ought to explain why the virtues are desirable. But this of course will not suffice. Practice in virtuous living ought to be given. (a) There ought, for example, to be a personal appeal made to the child to be honest for his own sake. Each child must live with his own conscience. He owes it to himself, to his own sense of values, to be virtuous. (b) The child ought to be taught the personal and social consequences of wrong-doing. He ought to understand that the penalty of lying is that he becomes a liar. He may, to be sure, be a liar whom society has forgiven, but all the same he is a liar. (c) He ought to be discouraged from imagining that he is the exception to the rule that sins will be found out sooner or later. Prisons are full of persons who thought they could "eat crackers without leaving crumbs." Practice in evil doing makes one proficient and skilful; but it also makes one bolder. Experience shows that in most cases boldness

increases more rapidly than skill and that failure is almost inevitable. Many persons might be saved from starting on wrong courses if they could be led to see that they are not exceptions to the rule.

The best way to teach the virtues is by imitation. Kindness begets kindness. "A soft answer turneth away wrath." The best disciplinarians are persons of self-control. The hasty, impetuous person invokes bad behavior. While it is easy to tell parents and teachers what they ought to be; it is almost impossible to cite many persons after whom they can pattern their own lives. It must be emphasized that little moral progress is possible apart from influence by imitation. Even when being virtuous seems only to lead to self-sacrifice others are spurred on to live virtuously because they admire the self-sacrificing principle. Long ago it was known that "the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church." For every man who dies in defense of the right, ten others will take up the fight after he is gone. The best asset the community can have is a righteous teacher who comes in contact sooner or later with all the children of the community. Through imitation alone such a teacher can wield untold influence.

(a) Teachers and parents ought to be conscious of this fact. A teacher who smokes may start a whole school of boys to smoking. A teacher who dresses extravagantly and extremely may set a whole school of girls to doing the same. (b) Persons in places of influence such as teachers, clergymen, city officials, statesmen and lawyers ought to exemplify in their personal living those virtues which they teach and preach. To do otherwise is hypocrisy. (c) Positive influence ought to be encouraged. If one man rakes his yard, his neighbor is likely to do the same. If one pupil cleans his desk, others are likely to do the same. If the teacher can secure a few students to embody in their lives certain virtues, all the pupils tend to imitate them.

Teachers and parents ought to have clear conceptions about the virtues. They ought to be able to converse freely and interestedly with their pupils about them. Of course the same is true of parents. With this thought in mind a few suggestions for explaining the value of certain virtues are given below. The idea is not that these suggestions could be used by others, but rather to show the possibility of each teacher or parent working out some scheme of his own.

THEME: HONESTY.

Question—Why should I be honest?

Answer —1. Because I do not want to deceive others and injure them.
2. Because I do not want to become a liar.

NOTES FOR PARENTS AND TEACHERS. Honesty should never be taught to be a "good policy." Honesty is not a policy but a principle of life. The man who is honest because it pays will always be tempted to be dishonest when he thinks it will pay. His mental attitude is, therefore, not on the side of honesty, but rather on the side of what pays. Honesty must be enjoined because it is right. Any other interpretation of it is vicious.

Honesty often has to do with confessions. By nature we have many experiences which we want to hold secret. It may be that they are not bad deeds; it may be that they only reveal little aspects of our nature that we do not want revealed. This is really a wholesome desire and should be respected. There is such a thing as being too frank, too free to tell of one's inner longings and desires. Many children are seemingly dishonest when questioned by an adult, not because they are ashamed of their conduct in itself, but because

they fear they will be ridiculed by the adult, since their ways are not his ways. Too often the child is right in his supposition. The worst forms of dishonesty, however, are those which have self aggrandizement for a foundation. (1) There is a strong tendency to be dishonest regarding material things. One may be dishonest in order that he may come into possession of something that does not really belong to him. This aspect, of course, is a most common form of adult sin. (2) A child may lie when he thinks he may avert punishment from himself to another. This is very common both in the home and in the playground. He ought to be shown how really despicable and anti-social such an attitude is. (3) The child may lie in order to keep appointments with other children. In all such cases he must be shown that lies almost always injure some one else who is innocent; and that they brand him also with lack of self-respect and a guilty conscience.

THEME: KINDNESS.

Question—Why should I be kind?

Answer —1. Because without kindness I am always hurting people's feelings and making them suffer.

2. Because being kind to others makes me feel more manly than if I have been harsh and unkind.

NOTES FOR PARENTS AND TEACHERS. Kindness is fundamentally a matter of unselfishness and in this respect is closely akin to generosity. Generosity, however, usually has to do with material things. Kindness is a spiritual quality, and usually is found in a person who appreciates the fundamental nature of human personality. The worst wounds are not physical. A broken heart is far more painful than a broken arm. Kindness, therefore, is a great spiritual virtue because it really conserves human personality. Harsh, cruel treatment of persons blight them and cause them to lose somewhat of the fineness of their souls. Kindness, on the other hand, enriches them and nourishes all that is fine in them. In showing the social aspects of kindness, show the infinite possibilities for hurting the feelings of others. Show how the human personality is made up largely of secret longings and aspirations. Show how each person longs to be appreciated, to be made to feel that he is not a burden and care, but a real asset and a necessary member of society. Harsh and unkind attitudes tend to separate people. Without kindness people may live together in loneliness. This causes pain of the deepest kind. The happy people are those who are kind; for kindness to others produces happiness and joy and peace of mind in both parties.

(3) THEME: GENEROSITY—Sharing with others.

Question—Why should I be generous?

Answer —1. Because I can help those who need help.

2. Because I enjoy sharing my things with others.

NOTES FOR PARENTS AND TEACHERS. In a sense, generosity is the expression of kindness. It is a proof that kindness is a genuine attribute. When we are generous we show that our kindness is not a matter of speech or sentiment, but that it possesses our whole nature. There are many fine aspects of generosity. (1) It is means of binding us to friends through memorials and tokens. To give a friend a book or some present is to give that friend a token of abiding fellowship. Human relationships are thus enriched and friendships are thereby enhanced. (2) To be willing to forego some of the pleasant things of life in order that one may help those who are in need builds up bonds of fellowship

among people of all classes. The man who will give up some personal pleasure in order to give to the Red Cross has blessed two souls, himself and another. (3) Generosity, if practiced when one is young, becomes an habitual attitude of mind which all through life inhibits the selfish and grasping tendencies. But, on the other hand, if one only mentally assents to the generous life without willingness to sacrifice and to support those causes which are for the uplift of others, sooner or later he will not even think in beneficent terms. (4) Perhaps one of the finest aspects of generosity is that it can be used as a means of bringing perpetual happiness to people, even after the donor has gone. The man who endows a hospital, or a library, or a church, or a home for orphans, has left behind him a means of making the world better long after he has gone. There is no reason why young people should not be encouraged to long to be philanthropic quite as well as to be rich. Therefore, it is well to put into their minds stories about philanthropic persons from the whole realm of history and literature so that they may get some conception of the magnanimity of the generous souls of the world.

(4) THEME: OBEDIENCE.

Question—Why should I obey my parents and teachers?

Answer —1. Because obedience keeps me from many blunders which may harm others.

2. Because obedience really makes me happier since it saves me from doing things that are wrong and harmful.

NOTES FOR PARENTS AND TEACHERS. It is not enough for children to have respect for the opinions of their loved ones and friends, but it is often necessary for them to obey whether they want to do so or not. If, for example, parents tell the children not to eat poison food, there must be no experimenting about it. Only strict obedience will suffice. In like manner, many moral issues are equally important. A child who lies or steals or commits fornication *even once* may do so to his lasting injury and shame. Moral educators are apt to be too lax on this point. There is a tendency to deal lightly with disobedience because the child cannot understand all the demands made of him or because he ought to be allowed time to shift from doing his own desires to doing the desires of the commanding party. While both of these facts are true, many situations in life require strict obedience. Each year has its toll of children who are killed because they disobeyed about handling a gun, or getting too near the water, or playing in the fire. In moral matters also, many situations admit of no time for waiting. A part of each child's training, therefore, must be to learn that for reasons wholly for his good, even though he may not understand them, he must give the strictest obedience to those in authority over him.

The illustrations for the social aspects of obedience are manifold. A boy disobeys about shooting his gun in the city, somebody is injured for life; if he cuts the rope which holds the boat, the boat is lost; if, while playing with matches, he sets the neighbor's barn on fire, the neighbor may suffer irreparable loss, or the boy's parents must make the loss good. A good illustration for the need of strict obedience is seen in the case of fire in any large building. If the people obey those who know better than they, usually little harm follows; but if each man disobeys, or if just one man disobeys, he may start a stampede which will result in the death of hundreds.

The individual aspects are also certain. The child can be made to see

how obedience saves him much time in studying. For example, suppose that the child disobeys his teacher in such a matter as spelling kite with a "y" instead of "i". Show him how all through his school course this will work against him and cause him to get low marks. So with careless habits of all kinds. The child who obeys saves time; he does not have to learn things in the harsh school of experience. Therefore, he is always ahead of the disobedient child and it is a matter of personal gain. The child who disobeys must be punished, not to make him suffer but to save him. The teacher can thus show the child how much better it is that he should obey promptly than to put his own judgments against the judgments of his teachers.

(5) **THEME: RESPECT FOR OPINIONS OF ELDERS, ESPECIALLY FOR PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND FRIENDS.**

Question—Why should I have respect for the opinions of my elders?

Answer —1. Because they are much wiser than I and have learned many things through experience.

2. Because they have my own best interests at heart.

NOTES FOR PARENTS AND TEACHERS. Older people know more than children because they have lived longer, and the longer people live, the more they learn. They have tried many things for themselves. Sometimes they have succeeded and sometimes they have failed. They remember both the successes and failures and want to tell the children how always to succeed and how never to fail. This is why it is natural for older people to give advice to the children. If they did not love them and want them to succeed, then they would not care whether the children made mistakes or not. Children ought to remember this when parents, teachers, pastors, or friends give them advice of any kind. Such persons are never to be considered the child's enemies, but always his friends. If the child does not agree with their judgments it is because he lacks experience; and because he lacks experience his judgments are not as good as those of older people. In most cases, the child when grown will be glad he followed the advice of his older friends and usually he sees the wisdom of their advice soon after he heeds or rejects it. For illustration of the general principle involved, the teacher can draw illustrations from life, such as: why parents keep the baby away from the stove, or away from the stair-way; why they do not want children to eat dirty food; why they do not want them to have wet feet; why they want them to go to school and to church, etc. Contrast the difference between adults who, when they were children, respected the opinions of their elders, and those who did not. But do not tell the children that failure to respect such opinions will land them in jail. As much as possible, only what is rational ought to enter here; and fear has little place in a rational scheme of interpretation.

(6) **TRUSTWORTHINESS.**

Question—Why should I be trustworthy?

Answer —1. Because I ought to learn to be depended upon so that I can be useful to others.

2. Because if I can be trusted, ever larger opportunities for work and service will come to me.

NOTES FOR PARENTS AND TEACHERS. This is commonly agreed to be one of the chief virtues. It is almost as popular a virtue as honesty among business men, and many place it above honesty, making honesty a mere phase of trustworthiness. It demands many other virtues which are commonly con-

sidered separately such as: punctuality, endurance, and williness to sacrifice. Its chief demands upon the individual are: (1) that it means that one must not change his mind after a promise has been made. That is, one must not accept responsibility which he does not fulfill. Even if his own circumstances suddenly change, he must suffer loss rather than break the trust that has been placed in him. (2) Also it demands ability to use one's judgment in solving of unforeseen circumstances. For example: a child is sent to a particular store for soap. He knows that his mother is washing. But when he arrives at the store he discovers that the store is temporarily out of soap. Suppose that he goes back home without the soap, instead of going to another store where he may buy it. Many similar situations could be listed. (3) It means loyalty to the one who has placed trust in you, even though other close friends intervene. Not to remain true to a trust, no matter how insignificant it may be, is to be a traitor. If one, for any reason, no longer feels that he can conscientiously be loyal to those who have placed trust in him, then he ought to go in person and inform them of his change of attitude. The teacher can have the children find examples in history of persons who were trustworthy and of those who were not. It is helpful, also, to show the child that the state and nation trusts him to make good use of his time, to study diligently, to keep the laws. If he fails, he thereby becomes untrustworthy.

CONCLUDING REMARKS. The virtues can be taught. Through explanation, through imitation, through training, it is possible to build up right attitudes which become fixed and permanent. But in this connection it is well to point out that: (1) Knowledge about the virtues may bring forth nothing but mental assent. Unless there is the actual performance of virtuous deeds, virtue has not been taught. (2) The training in building up virtuous habits must be left to the individual parent and teacher. No rules can be laid down. Each day brings forth problems and temptations. These furnish the circumstances out of which virtuous habits must be formed. Individual teachers and individual children vary so much that a set of rules for moral training of children is of little value. (3) The value of studying methods lies in the suggestibility of the methods rather than in their application. No two situations are to be dealt with exactly alike because no two persons are exactly alike. But suggestions show one how to attack his difficulties. (4) The child's environment ought to offer a minimum of conflicting ideals and standards. If the home, the school, the play-ground and the church can all work toward the same moral goals, the problem of moral training is greatly simplified. (5) The writer believes that there is an element of attractiveness in virtuous living. The lives of really great men suggest that they were attracted by the higher things of life. The teacher who can help the child discover this attractiveness has performed a significant service to the individual and to society. Teachers might have the pupils collect and file clippings of the good results of righteous living and of the bad results of unrighteous living from their daily readings.

THE VALUE OF STUDYING THE INDIVIDUAL CHILD

Chapter V

PURPOSE OF STUDY. For a period of almost five years the writer has carried on experiments with his two sons, and for two years with his daughter. From these experiments only a few are selected to show not only the results, but especially to show what might be done in any home. Two experiments are chosen from those performed by the older son and his mother. Two are chosen from those performed by the second son. A sample of a behavior diary is also included.

The moral information afforded by such studies is not easily measured. This is necessarily true because morality is not something separate from action. It is the way one acts. The purpose in making such experiments was simple. *It was the desire to know each child more accurately than is possible by casual observations.* The writer believes that parents do know their children *well* without such experiments. But he also believes that they can know their children *better* with the aid of such simple studies. Aside from this principal desire there were two less important desires: (1) to study individual differences among brothers, and (2) to see what could be learned about correction from such studies. The writer began with the assumption that the same methods which would make the boy write or spell better would also make him live better. If he could discover how to correct the child economically in any kind of learning, he believed this would throw light upon how to correct the child in moral learning. The chief desire, however, has been largely attained. However imperfectly the writer knows the children, he believes he knows them immeasurably better than he would had he followed the usual customs of parents who take it for granted that the child is getting on all right without their aid or interest.

TWO TYPICAL TESTS. The following tests were given to a boy during his sixth year. In each case his score was compared with studies given to a larger group his own age. The purposes of the test were to (a) ascertain the mental alertness of the boy, and (2) see what light such tests would throw upon the question of the boy's moral training.

The boy presented certain difficulties in behavior. As compared with his older brother, he did not respond so well when a definite goal was set before him. He had certain habits which were hard to break. Various methods of punishment had failed to break habits in him which had been easily broken in his older brother. It was hoped that a close analysis of the boy's thought processes might reveal some way of securing his own interest in breaking habits and in forming new ones.

1. The first test was given from Winch's¹ book on children's perceptions. The plan of the book is as follows. A simple picture of a woman and a boy is shown. The woman is holding a loaf of German bread. The boy is about to take a bite from a piece of bread which the woman has cut for him. A chair, a flower pot, a large book, a table, a box with a blooming flower sitting on its top compose the furniture of the room. The door stands half open. The woman wears a blue dress with a red pinafore. The boy wears a green coat and red trousers which match the woman's pinafore.

The picture was shown to the child who studied it for one minute. The child was told, "A picture is to be shown to you. You are to study it for just

1. Winch, WH., *Children's Perceptions*

one minute. Then you are to answer all the questions about the picture which I ask you." As soon as the picture had been studied, the child was allowed to describe it as a unit. This was recorded verbatim by the experimenter. After this a set of fifty questions was asked about the picture. One week later the same questions were asked, though there had been no review on the part of the boy.

The results of the test when compared with the studies reported by Winch showed that the boy was decidedly above those of his own age. Some allowance must be made for the fact that the child took the test under favorable circumstances. The test seemed to indicate four things about the boy's ability to observe. (1) He was accurate. (2) He remembered details. (3) He was positive in his answers. He could not be shaken from his opinion whether he was right or wrong. (4) His imagination added certain details to the picture which he gave as a kind of interpretation. The test seemed to reveal that the boy was mentally alert. He enjoyed the experiment and wanted others like it. He did complain, however, that there were too many questions.

2. A second test was given to the boy from a study by Grace Adelaide Taylor.² The book contains 230 questions. Seven of these questions are listed as "Personal Information," sixty-one questions are headed "General Information," nine questions relative to "Knowledge of Parts," twenty-eight questions on "Life Situations." Other questions refer to Vocabulary, Memory, Color, Form, Drawing, Rhythms, Origins.

The list of questions on "Comprehension of Social or Moral Situations" consisted of ten questions on hypothetical moral and social situations. Their value is not especially great in that they require bright-mindedness for good answers rather than any moral experience. This is probably true of most sets of questions designed to ascertain the child's moral conceptions.

There are many other topics in the list such as "Time," "Orientation," etc., which we shall not list here.

SOME TYPICAL ANSWERS. In answer to questions concerning current events, the boy did especially well. The fact that the evening paper was frequently read and discussed at the supper table probably accounts for his excellency at this particular type of answer.

A list of ten of his answers gives some clue to his mental responses.

1. Q. Tell me one thing your heart does for your body.
A. It gives the blood power to go all around through the body.
2. Q. Tell the parts of a wagon.
A. Wheels, springs, tongue, bed, taps, washers, axles.
3. Q. Where would you go if you wanted to buy beer?
A. To a beer shop if they were allowed to keep open. (The boy has never seen a saloon)
4. Q. How would you cut an apple pie for four people?
A. Cut in the middle both ways. (Motions correctly)
5. Q. Tell me one thing you would do if a boy ran away with your hat.
A. It would depend upon the size of the boy.
6. Q. Tell me the parts of a book.
A. Pages, two backs or a cover, words and sometimes pictures

2. Taylor, Grace A., *An Inventory of Minds of Six and Seven Years Mental Age*.

7. Q. How many minutes would you boil an egg?
A. Till I thought it was done. About ten minutes for a hard egg, and about two minutes for a soft egg.
8. Q. Where do birds go in winter?
A. Some go south. Some stay where they are.
9. Q. Suppose some one left a nice big dish of candy on the table and you promised not to touch it. If every one went away but you, tell me one thing you would do.
A. I would be sorry I made the promise.
10. Q. Where do eggs come from?
A. First from hens, then from the store.

These answers are not especially brilliant but they suggested one element in the boy's mental processes which the parents have been working on since. These answers and many of the others suggested to the parents that the boy had a kind of shrewdness that was not apparent in his brother, or in other boys near his own age.

How would such a characteristic manifest itself in his moral behavior? The logical conclusion was that it would manifest itself by independent thought in trying to evade certain requirements. In order to see if this were true, certain "traps" were set for the boy. One of his faults was that he was often late from school. He always gave the excuse that he stopped to watch people. He answered this because he thought that would suffice. He was watched and it was discovered that he was going up town frequently with another boy to buy candy. He would run in order to make up for the time consumed in the trip. When the store was not full of customers, he could still get home at the appointed time. But when the store was full of customers, he was late. His trick worked all right in the realm where he had control. Another fault of which he could not be broken was that of getting his feet wet. Punishment had little effect. He claimed that the walks were full of puddles. When this was shown to be wrong, he then laid the wet feet to the water standing on the playground. This excuse also proved to be untrue. By watching him it was found that he was in a gang who dared each other to wade in water with their shoes on. He could not withstand the dare of his play-mates, even when he knew that to accept the dare would mean punishment. It was obvious that the only way to deal with the situation was to break up the group with which he came home. That solved both problems.

That the answers to the questions should throw any light upon his moral life seemed irrelevant. But such is the case. His answers suggested that *in a given situation he saw more than one possibility*. From this it was logical to suppose that he saw more than one possibility in moral situations. Following this suggestion, several of his faults have been immediately corrected. The immediate result of the study was that it led to a more careful study of the boy's actual conduct.

NOTES ON BEHAVIOR. Actual Behavior Record of Samuel E. Braden. May, 1922. He was 7 yrs. 11 months old.

1. Helped carry out clothes to line. Cleaned basement. Washed down cellar stairs. Commended for doing work well.
2. Ironed handkerchiefs. Worked in garden.
3. It was circus day. He wanted to go. But instead he stayed and helped paint. He beat rug. Rewarded with twenty-five cents.

- .. Went to buy provisions. Forgot his memoranda. Had no meat for supper. His punishment was that the whole family was made to do without meat. He cried.
5. For teasing brother he had to eat supper alone.
6. Bought provisions. Made correct change and no errors. Rewarded by commendation.
7. Attended church and Sunday School. After dinner he learned a hymn. Rewarded by taking supper to the woods.
8. Washed down basement stairs. Cleaned basement. Carried out ashes.
9. Left wagon out over night. It rained on it. Punished by being denied the use of the wagon for a day.
10. Walked more than a mile to farm for eggs. He returned promptly. Rewarded with five cents.
11. Bought provisions. Was told to get whole wheat bread. He substituted white bread for it because there was no whole wheat bread. He was praised for using his judgment.
12. Picked up all trash in back yard. Was rewarded because of his thoroughness.
13. Beat rugs, wiped three windows. Stayed half-hour with his sister. Commended for making it possible for his mother to have a rest.
14. Ran off from younger brother. Was punished by isolation for an hour for "breaking the family spirit."
15. Washed basement stairs. Cleaned basement. Dusted living-room. Commended for thoroughness.
16. Ironed handkerchiefs. Played with his sister.
17. Went for provisions. Made a mistake in change. Had to return to rectify mistake. Admonished to be careful.
18. Stayed out late playing with neighbor boy without permission. He was punished by whipping.
19. Cleaned basement. Did a chore for neighbor. Rewarded with an ice-cream cone.
20. Worked in morning helping mother clean house. Rewarded with permission to play all afternoon with neighbor boy.
21. Went to S. S. Brought sister home. Put her to bed for her nap. Rewarded by going for picnic supper.
22. Carried clothes to line. Washed basement stairs. Did an errand for neighbor. Was commended for his good spirit.
23. Brought home report card. Had four "E's" and two "S's." Was given three dollars as reward. Money deposited.
24. Took a letter to P. O. Commended for quick trip.
25. Helped a lady carry bundles on own initiative. Commended.
26. Threw ball through window. Paid one dollar from his own funds.
27. Bought provisions. Made correct change and was prompt.
28. Refused to sing at S. S. because he was bashful. Was scolded for unwillingness.
29. Ate candy between meals which was forbidden. Was punished by being denied any candy for four days while his brother and sister had it.
30. Ironed all the handkerchiefs. Did well. Reward of five cents.
31. Dug dandelions. Pay, one cent per dozen. Dug all he could find.

Behavior Record for Samuel E. Braden. May, 1923. He was 8 yrs 11 months old.

1. Set out onions on his own responsibility. They were to be his and he was to sell them when grown. His rows were straight.
2. Went to buy provisions. Stayed to watch workmen without permission. Punishment was denial of play for a half-day.
3. Cut up boxes for kindling. Reward of five cents because without being told he piled it in a neat pile.
4. Worked in his garden preparing new garden beds.
5. Painted back fence. Commended for faithfulness. He worked for two and one-half hours without intermission.
6. Went to S. S. Came home with his sister. Learned a hymn after dinner.
7. Helped with washing. Carried out clothes.
8. Made toast for breakfast, dished up breakfast food, etc., while his mother sewed for him. He was commended for his willing spirit.
9. Played ball on way home from school. Punishment by eating alone and going to bed.
10. Dressed his sister, finding all her clothes. Commended for not calling once to his mother about where to find things.
11. Raked the yard, Rewarded with ten cents.
12. Painted lattice work and also back fence. Pay ten cents.
13. Brought sister home from S. S. Set the table for dinner without being told.
14. Made toast for breakfast and dressed his sister while mother started washing. Put the clothes through the wringer.
15. Fought with neighbor boy. Punished by isolation for several hours. He was not guilty of starting the fight.
16. Worked in garden. His garden was sprouting and he felt much pride in it.
17. Worked on flower beds. Made brick edge for flower beds the way he had seen a neighbor make them.
18. Brought home his report card. Had five "E's." A dollar for each "E" was deposited in his name. He felt this was a most satisfactory reward.
19. Cut kindling. Went up town on errands. Was punctual and made no mistakes in purchases.
20. Went to S. S. Stayed for church. After dinner, helped wash dishes.
21. Helped with washing. Cleaned basement. Was commended for thoroughness.
22. Made toast, dished breakfast food. Washed breakfast dishes. Ironed handkerchiefs. Pay fifteen cents.
23. Hoed in garden. Cleaned vegetables for dinner.
24. Went to spend day at the Brick Yard. He enjoyed studying the process of making bricks, especially the steam shovel.
25. Took out large rug and beat it well. Pay 10 cents.
26. Bought provisions. Used judgment in making substitutions where necessary.
27. Brought sister home from church. Started meat cooking. Watched it till mother returned.
28. Helped wash. Carried out clothes to the line. Cleaned basement.
29. Ironed handkerchiefs. Cleaned and dusted two rooms.

30. Worked in garden. Gathered and cleaned vegetables. Went on errand for neighbor. Pay 15 cents.
31. Mowed the grass. Raked yard. Pulled weeds. Pay 10 cents.

The diary of these two months illustrates the parents' conceptions of several factors in moral education. (1) The relative seriousness of disobedience, especially the disobedience of not coming straight home from school without permission. The parents do consider that this is one of the most serious faults of children. They have made some inquiry into the records of those children who loiter on the way home from school. There is a marked relationship between loitering and delinquency, to say nothing of the relationship between loitering and poor school work. (2) The diary reveals that the parents tried to make the child responsible. This, they believe, is one of their chief functions as parents. (3) It shows the value they put on school work by rewarding good marks. There is some doubt if this is wise. (4) The diary shows that the boy was punished twelve times in these two months. In May, 1922, he was punished nine times. In the same month a year later he was punished only three times. This is indicative of two things: (a) that punishment has had its effect by making the boy more thoughtful and careful; (b) that a more rational view of his responsibility in the family takes much of his behavior out of the realm of duty. In the latter month he did many things without being told. (5) The record shows that he was doing successful work in school. The first month's record shows his work in the third grade. The next year he was in the fourth grade. In both grades he happened to be a few months younger than anyone else in the room. The diary since May, 1923, shows that he has been punished but five times. There has been no conscious lowering of the standard of behavior on the part of the parents. During this time the boy has grown rapidly in stature. He has also been promoted to sixth grade work in school where he is doing superior work. He is a happy, hearty fellow who loves to play. He rides a bicycle which he enjoys very much. He is interested in ball-games of all kinds, in making bows and arrows, in naming the songbirds, in doing all the things which most boys like to do. It is too soon to predict what the influence of his training has been. At present three things seem to be in the process of realization: (1) He is responding willfully to the desire of his parents that he do good school work. (2) He needs punishment less frequently, which indicates that he is learning self-control. (3) He is developing a spirit of helpfulness which is wholly spontaneous. No predictions are made for his future behavior, because his habits are not sufficiently formed to give any degree of permanency.

COMPETITIVE LEARNING BETWEEN ADULT AND CHILD. Two experiments were carried on at the same time, one in the forenoon, the other in the afternoon. One was an experiment in ball tossing, the other was an experiment in substitution. The subjects were a mother and son. The mother was thirty-two years of age, and the boy was not quite six when the experiments began, and was a few days past six when the experiments were ended. The mother is a college graduate, while the boy's only school experience when the experiments were begun was nine months in a kindergarten. The experiments were carried on in a home, a special room being set apart for the purpose. No practice was permitted between trials. Both subjects took the experiments seriously. There was no attempt on the mother's part to do poorly that she might spare the boy's feelings. The experiments were first begun May 4th, 1920, continuing for fourteen days. In November, 1923, three years and six months later, the identical experiments were performed the second time.

(1) **BALL-TOSSING.** For the ball-tossing, a box with a five-inch hole in the top, and twenty-five rubber balls composed the apparatus. The box was approximately $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches high, 9 inches long, and 7 inches wide. A two-inch strip nailed to the back of the box at the bottom gave the necessary slope. The rubber balls were almost an inch in diameter. The boy stood back of a line eight feet from the box, while the mother stood about fourteen inches behind this line, or 9 feet, 2 inches from the box. The purpose was that the distance from the finger tips to the box, just as the ball was released from the hand, might be the same for both.

Only the balls which fell into the box were scored. Each subject threw twenty-five balls, alternating trials. Thus fifty balls were thrown for one day's score. The score was kept for each twenty-five balls, as well as for each fifty. The boy's scores are: 3; 1; 0; 1; 1; 5; 4; 4; 3; 3; 1; 0; 1; 0; total, 27. The mother's scores are: 12; 12; 13; 14; 20; 26; 16; 13; 14; 15; 11; 26; 23; 25; total, 240.

RELEARNING IN BALL-TOSSING. After three and one-half years the test was repeated just as it was originally given. The scores show that the boy has made great relative improvement. His total score lacks but 24 balls of being as high as the mother made three and one-half years before. That is, after a period of three and one-half years the boy can do as well as his mother did in the first experiment. Almost as significant as this, however, is the fact that the mother's score on the re-trial shows marked improvement. Her scores for the two series are 240 and 336. There is here evidence of exceptional retention in view of the fact that the experiment was not carried on long enough during the original trial to secure a high degree of constancy. The best explanation is perhaps that the subject was in much better physical health. The boy's scores were: 10; 12; 12; 14; 16; 14; 18; 20; 18; 20; 18; 22; 20; 22; total, 236. The mother's scores were: 16; 20; 22; 24; 24; 24; 26; 22; 24; 22; 28; 28; 26; 30; total, 336.

(2) **DIGIT-LETTER SUBSTITUTION.** A sheet of paper having two columns of five digits with five blank spaces immediately at the right of each row of digits was used. Twenty rows of digits composed each column, making forty in all, or 200 separate digits.

The test consisted of substituting letters for the digits. The same digits were used each day, that is, each day the subject began at the first row in the first column. The scheme was as follows: 1-c; 2-l; 3-n; 4-4; 5-2; 6-1; 7-x; 8-d; 9-j. (See substitution Test Sheet.). A pencil was used in writing. The length of the experiment was three minutes. On the first day a study period of three minutes was allowed. The key was permitted to be used throughout, though even the boy rarely referred to it after the first two days. The mother's scores are as follows: (1) original, 68; 70; 71; 73; 84; 83; 81; 83; 93; 91; 96; 102; 108; 105; 112; 121; 134; 142; 130; 130; 132; 135; 141. (2) relearning, 84; 90; 92; 108; 120; 121; 121; 126; 128; 126; 130; 135; 132; 138; 145; 140; 150; 155; 152; 160; 168; 170; 165. The boy's scores are as follows: (1) original, 12; 15; 20; 27; 26; 32; 30; 33; 30; 24; 36; 39; 38; 35; 39; 44; 47; 52; 50; 63; 61; 60; 63. (2) relearning, 50; 62; 64; 68; 70; 71; 69; 68; 75; 78; 74; 86; 94; 102; 105; 110; 117; 120; 124; 128; 132; 130; 134.

The relearning in the substitution reveals many interesting things, most of which are to be seen from a study of the graph. During the interval between experiments the boy improved in muscular control, and learned to write much faster. That the boy's second score is almost as high as the mother's first score

is significant. That the mother raised her score from 240 to 336, considering totals, is indicative of a decided improvement.

INFERENCES FROM THE EXPERIMENTS WHICH THROW LIGHT UPON MORAL TRAINING. 1. *Such experiments tend to give the parent a sympathetic understanding of the child.* The child learns slowly, though he tries diligently. When the mother sees that her own record is full of apparent failures and slumps, she sees that the child's struggle has been the same as hers, except that added years of experience have equipped her for the struggle in a way that the child has not been equipped. All learning is done by struggling. Moral learning is no exception. Just as one may not do equally well at ball-tossing on two successive days, so he may not be able to withstand temptation equally well on two successive days. The child, like the adult, does not have absolute control over his own abilities, and whether the struggle is one of throwing balls or of withstanding temptation, some days he does poorly, other days he does well.

2. *Such experiments show the fallacy of hasty conclusions.* Suppose that after the child has done poorly, the parent scolds him and tells him it is useless for him to try further, and thus discourages him without extending the experiment over a number of days. It is evident that no proper measure of ability is thus gained. This is clearly seen in the case of the substitution test. The boy starts out slowly. It seems as if he can accomplish little or nothing. His graph also shows occasional slumps. But taking it over a period of a month he has made remarkable progress. Whereas encouragement helped to increase, his ability, discouragement would have been fatal. It is obvious that in moral situations the same principles may obtain. If a certain act has been forbidden, the parent should not lose his patience at the first infraction. The time element should be considered and the growth and failures ought to be observed for periods of weeks and months. In this way moral encouragement will be substituted for moral discouragement and the child's moral advance will be greatly accelerated. In actual experience one failure on the part of the child calls forth the disapproval and even the wrath of the parent and the cumulative effect of this constantly recurring attitude of the parent can do nothing less than discourage and harden the child's mind.

3. *The experiment throws light upon the problem of ability.* Some tasks are beyond the child at a given age. This is shown in the ball-tossing experiment. If the child had stood a foot or two nearer the box, his graph might have shown growth and success instead of discouragement and failure. At this particular age, the experiment was beyond his ability. But after three and one-half years he is able to compete favorably with his mother. Some days he does as well as she did in the first experiment. The moral inference is obvious. There are times when it is impossible for the child to be honest. His imagination is too active, or he has not yet learned to inhibit selfish desires and in his eagerness to put himself in a good light he lies. Or there are times when the child is unable to keep from tearing things to pieces. He knows that he should not do so, but as yet he has not secured sufficient control of his instinctive nature. Just as in the ball-tossing experiment it was not merely a question of will power but of actual inability, so in the moral sphere it may be that where two or three natural tendencies impel a child to action, to give him time to gain the inhibitive mastery over them is the only solution. In three years and a half the boy had gained motor control in a hundred ways, and he could apply this control to the second ball-tossing experiment. In a similar way the child, as he grows older, gradually learns to inhibit his own desires and to substitute

for them the wishes of his elders. Here again, encouragement accelerated the progress, whereas scolding and discouragement and punishment in all probability retard the development. The parent in such cases defeats his own purpose by not taking the facts into consideration. This is opposed to the theory of unyielding sternness on the part of the parent, but if we concede that all learning goes on in accordance with the same mental processes, then we must acknowledge the validity of the argument for time, encouragement, and development in the moral life.

4. *The experiments show the value of self-competition.* In an ideal way such studies bring the child into favorable circumstances of competition with those who have his best interests at heart. But the experiment reveals something which is probably more significant than this. The child is brought face to face with his own records. He competes with himself. If he loafs today, he suffers for it tomorrow. But if he works hard today, even though his score is low, he reaps the fruits of his industriousness on the morrow. Here is a vital moral principle for the child to learn. He cannot ignore the law of use and disuse; he cannot ignore the law that to him that hath, more will be given. Efficiency begets more efficiency, but sloth begets failure. From this factual evidence which the child soon recognizes, the parent can easily get him to see that it is not sufficient for him to try to do as well as other children, or to suppose when his grades are as good as theirs that he has done well. If he has not competed favorably with his own ability, he has failed. In time such a habit will bring him to mediocrity rather than to superiority. And so with moral attainment. The child must not suppose that he is good enough when he is as good as others. This is the spirit of the pharisee who thanked God that he was not like other men, for he had actually outstripped some of them in outward morality.³ His failure was that there still remained within his own heart many sins of pride and selfishness which he had not cast out. In competition with his own best self he had failed. Few more needed moral lessons can be taught than this one, and seemingly here is a good factual background for it. One's own records help him to face his own abilities and habits. To be the best one can be is the final test of morality.

5. *The stimulating effect of success—the disheartening effect of failure.* These factors have already been alluded to, but they are worthy of special consideration. In the substitution experiment, the child's success was apparent. He could measure his own improvement over his initial trial any day and see that he had gained much. He was thus spurred on to see if he could not gain as fast as his mother. He wanted to do better than which he was already doing well. This principle is far-reaching. If men like to do better than which they already do well, perhaps such a principle could be made use of in moral development. For example, if a boy is trustworthy, say in shopping, and if this trustworthiness is magnified in the home, the tendency will be for the child to seek to improve more and more. He will never be satisfied with a lower level when he can reach a higher one. This, then, leads to a second consideration. Would it not be well to take one virtue at a time and dwell on the improvement and success of the child, and thus give him the stimulating influence which accompanies success?

This was Franklin's notion. He would practice one virtue until he had acquired some degree of constancy. But unquestionably such a process is accelerated and made much easier if success is emphasized so that it stimulates,

3. Luke, 18:11.

and if apparent failures are held in the background. Nothing seems more deadening in the moral world than for the child to suppose that nothing is expected of him. Occasionally we hear some say that this only spurs the child on to prove his worth, that it stirs up within the child the "I'll show you" spirit. But it is probable that for every child that is benefitted by the treatment of discouragement, a thousand are pushed farther back into mediocrity and commonplaceness. In the experiment of ball-tossing the first series of trials show the effect of discouragement on the child's mind. He soon reached the place where he did not care. Failure was accompanied by a feeling of indifference, then this was followed by a feeling of hatred for the task. Such concomitant attitudes, while one works, tend to dissipate one's energies and abilities. But after three years the boy comes to the same experience and, with some degree of success to goad him on, he makes a remarkable "comeback" in which he almost equals his mother's first record. The lesson for the moral educator is this: Put all moral problems within reach of the child's ability so that success will be possible, and therefore praise will be possible. If the child repeatedly fails on some issue, lower the standard. This is against most theories of child-raising. But one may ask what the purpose of moral training is. Is it to preserve some traditional standard and method, or is it to preserve the confidence and good-will of the child until under direction and nurture he has attained the stature of a strong moral man? In moral attainment as in ball-tossing, one cannot expect the child to make as high a score as the adult. The parent will be satisfied if he sees definite signs of progress.

6. *The experiments also suggest that adults can still keep on improving.* Just as the mother showed marked improvement in ball-tossing and in substitution, so the inference is that she can keep on improving in kindness, in sympathy, in her ability to see the other person's view-point. In other words, if the adult can learn to make substitutions better with practice, so he can learn to be better morally with practice. Each temptation successfully met equips him so that he meets the next temptation with more strength. To expect the adult constantly to improve morally is almost a new thought. But it seemingly is possible for him to do so.

7. *The experiments suggest a possible approach to the "bad" or unruly child.* It is only by such a method that the parent can understand how hard a fight the child is really making. Of course, merely to discover that the child is trying has no element of finality in it, for the purpose of the parent is to change the child's disposition. But knowing that a child is conscientiously striving at a given task changes the attitude of the parent and gives him a more hopeful spirit in which to work. For example, if the parent can assure himself that the child is actually struggling to attain a given goal, even though failure is more apparent than success, the parent can be patient while he sets himself at the task of finding and removing whatever obstacles are in the way. The reason the boy of five years of age did not do well at ball-tossing was not that he was wilfully disobedient when he was told to throw the balls into the box. Other factors were involved. Unseen obstacles had to be overcome. In his case they were the obstacles of inexperience and lack of muscular control. Whipping, then, would have done no good; for this was no case for punishment. It was a case where only time and nurture could bring about the desired results. So, the inference is, that such tests indicate that in many cases where children fail to respond to the moral requirements of the parent, the parent should make sure whether the child has the ability to perform

but stubbornly or lazily refuses to do so, or whether the child fails because of temporary (or permanent) inability. In the first case, punishment might be the only cure; in the second case, punishment would only be a sure curse. Whipping a balky horse may help if he actually has the strength to pull the load; but if he has not the strength, the whipping not only does not supply more strength, but it creates unwholesome attitudes in the horse which are very painfully overcome. While there is, perhaps, no new principle involved here, it seems of value in the problem of punishment and correction that the parent understand the exact nature of the failure. The experiments suggest that if one submits the child to the same stimulus for several days he will have a proper evaluation of the real difficulty. Only after such a procedure will he know how constructively to deal with the child.

CORRECTION AND PUNISHMENT

Chapter VI

PURPOSE OF CORRECTION. The purpose of correction, while it may be said to be simple, must always be kept in mind in all education. The nature of correction may differ according to its purpose. (1) The most simple form of correction is that of pointing out the error of some detail and trying to get the learner to repeat the performance in order that the error may be eliminated. (2) Another form of correction is to secure general improvement. There may be no glaring faults or errors in a piece of work, but there is still room for general improvement. Correction, in this sense, seeks a better production. (3) A third form of correction is necessary in those instances where the learner is wholly wrong. If the child is trying to work an arithmetic problem by subtraction when multiplication is the only possible process, the purpose of correction is to get him to work with the right principles. This form of correction is much used in moral training and probably deserves far more attention than it gets from teachers and parents. With this brief outline in mind, we can say that the purpose of correction is to help the learner improve a detail, or to improve the entire effort by making it better, or to start the learner on an entirely new way of performing his task.

ATTITUDE OF LEARNER. If correction is to be effective there must be mutual cooperation between teacher and learner. If the learner has hostile attitudes, correction loses most of its efficacy. But if the learner's attitude is one of receptivity—if he really cherishes correction—learning is much facilitated. The attitude of the teacher is also important; for, in large measure, it pre-determines the responsive attitude of the learner. The learner's responses will usually be satisfactory if the teacher can make it evident that: (1) she really wants the learner to improve and that she gets no delight in merely pointing out mistakes; and (2) that she believes the learner can improve by manifesting a spirit of hopefulness; and (3) that the learner is really unfair to himself unless he improves his work to the best of his ability. But if the teacher makes the learner feel that he is a kind of ne'er-do-well—a stupid "dumb-head"—correction usually tends merely to separate the teacher from pupil by an ever increasing distance. As Mr. Dooley is reported to have said, "it makes no difference what you teach the boy so long as he doesn't like it." While it cannot be said that if the teacher has the right attitude the learner will also acquire the right attitude, it can be said that rarely does the learner have the right attitude toward correction unless the teacher has first won his confidence and respect.

In cases where the learner's attitudes alone are faulty, the teacher must seek to bring about a change in spirit. Otherwise, learning by means of correction is reduced to a minimum. For illustration of this principle, we might leave the family or the school-room to study the behavior of children in houses of correction. That so many of the inmates of these institutions are returned to society without having been changed for the better is an indication of the futility of correction where there is not mutual confidence and respect between teacher and learner. In some instances, the best way to secure a change in the child's attitude is to change his environment for a few days. This may be done by a short visit to some of his relatives. The desired change may be secured by putting him in another school if this is possible. Unfortunately, our school system rarely permits a child to change from one teacher to another because

"he doesn't like the teacher." One may ask if such a situation is not serious enough to demand more careful attention. Many a parent has worked and worried through a whole school year scolding and whipping, only to find at the beginning of the next year's work that trouble disappeared when the child was put under another teacher.

CORRECTION AND PUNISHMENT. It is obvious from what we have already said that punishment is not always necessary in correction. As a matter of fact, the more correction we can secure without punishment, the better. But there is no doubt that punishment is occasionally necessary in securing the desirable corrections in all learners and that in the case of certain learners, punishment must be applied rigorously and frequently. If children are trained by kindness alone they are not fitted for the severity of life's discipline. Nature's laws are severe. Nature does not coax and beg and plead. Men either obey her laws and live successfully, or ignore her laws to their own injury. It can hardly be supposed that any child can live without facing the austere element in life. There is no better way to help the child to face life masterfully than to accustom the child to deal successfully with difficulties.

There are five or six kinds of punishment which have been tried for centuries to procure or hasten the process of reformation. There is perhaps no need to devise any new principles. (1) There is the form of punishment known as *satiety*. The child is punished for wrong-doing by making him indulge in the very act until he "has enough" of it. (2) *Denial* as a form of punishment is as old as the race. One is made to suffer in being denied that which he cherishes. Usually food and freedom are the things denied, though in the case of children there are many little privileges and pleasures which may be denied as a part of punishment. (3) *Corporal punishment* is also as old as history. It is a quick method as well as a drastic one, and for many children accomplishes much good. (4) *Punishment by rebuke* is a most efficacious form of punishment. It aims to secure a contrite spirit on the part of the offender in order that true repentance will follow. (5) *Punishment by lack of attention*. The offender is denied fellowship. Temporarily his presence is ignored. The purpose of such punishment is to shame the offender. (6) Added to this is another form of punishment which some persons use with great efficacy. It may be called *vicarious punishment*. The parent or teacher suffers not only because of some offense; but instead of the offender. While this method of punishment seems to put the suffering on the wrong person, it sometimes secures restoration when all other methods have failed. But by its very nature it must be genuinely felt. One can hardly hope to feign the vicarious spirit with good results.

Our interest at present is not to discuss the efficacy of different forms of punishment. We do want to insist, however, that whatever form of punishment is used should be used with a definite purpose. Punishment defeats its purpose unless it accomplishes a change of attitude or of behavior. The danger in all punishment lies in the fact that it may steep the offender the deeper in his sins. It may separate the offender further from those who alone can help him.

SOME QUESTIONABLE THEORIES OF TEACHING. For thirty years or more educators have been experimenting with new theories of learning. Various attempts to do away with older forms of controlling behavior have been made. One opinion is that (1) *the child should never be punished*. This theory is based upon the belief in the "innocency" of the child in contradistinction to the old theory of an inherited sinful nature. The child is thought to be a bud.

The teacher is to see that the warmth and water and care necessary to insure the proper unfolding of the bud are supplied. The child, on this theory, is always right. If he fails to respond to a given situation, the situation should be changed. If the child refuses to obey the teacher, let the teacher obey the child. The fallacy of this theory is patent. The child is not innocent by nature. He has tendencies which, if long exercised, will bring about his own moral and physical ruin. Because of his very nature the teacher must correct him. Only thus can the "bud" develop into the "beautiful flower." (2) A second erroneous theory of teaching is that all learning must be reduced to "play." It is almost impossible to point out the fallacy of this theory without doing injustice to it. The theory has much basic truth in it. On the other hand, to arrange only pleasant situations for the child is unfair to him for the simple reason that education must have in mind the child's ulterior life as well as his present welfare and enjoyment. It is most certain that life will not always present pleasant situations to the child; and it stands to reason that the only way to prepare the child for the shocks of life is to arrange situations which have in them difficulties which the child himself must overcome. Fortunate is the child who learns to meet the hard things in life under the care of a parent or teacher who would strengthen him for life not by having him avoid difficulties, but by having him conquer them. Here, then, is the fallacy of this theory: (a) It fails to provide sufficiently for the child's future by giving undue emphasis to the present. (b) It trains the child for life by avoiding difficulties rather than by teaching him to master them. (3) *A third theory of education unduly emphasizes freedom.* For example, it claims that the child should not be required to study because this limits his freedom. He should be free to follow his roving instinct where he will. From one uncompleted task to another he may go uninterrupted so long as he follows his "interests." This theory seems to take it for granted that the child by nature has "interests" which instinctively guide him. Just as the bird knows *how* and *when* and *where* to build the nest, so the child knows *how* and *when* and *where* to do what is best for him. But the experience of the race is all against this conception. There is no "guiding instinct" which points out the way to the child. If left alone he will follow the path of least resistance. Following this path may bring temporary pleasures; but the end will be grief. The child should study, should learn to obey, should learn to work while he is young. While he is young the conditions under which he may learn are favorable. Of this he can be sure, that he cannot escape the more rigorous aspects of life. If he waits till maturity to learn his lessons, his teachers will not be as kind and his environment not so helpful.

The chief reasons for referring to such theories of education here is that all of them claim to rest on psychology. But at best it is only a sentimental psychology. A psychological basis for education requires that we pay attention not to one aspect of human nature but to all. To single out one or two principles to the exclusion of others is the poorest possible psychology. In fact psychology aims to do away with just this condition in the whole educational field. While all such theories have elements of truth in them, they fail in their insufficiency. If carried to their logical ends they would produce molley-coddles and outlaws—they are not designed to produce virile men and women. We believe that any system of teaching which tends to minimize the element of correction is psychologically unsound for three reasons: (1) Only by correction can the child learn all that he needs to know before he becomes an adult with the accompanying responsibilities. (2) Only by a long series of

corrections can the child gain any degree of self-mastery. He will always be flying off into fits of passion or into paths of fruitless endeavor unless his training has corrected this tendency again and again. (3) Only by correction can the child reach any degree of efficiency. Any system which minimizes correction as a basic factor in education increases the likelihood that the individual will be mediocre. Rigorous discipline and strict correction produce moral giants, while laxity and coddling produce moral pigmies.

But we must not be misunderstood. It is possible to correct without punishment, and we have already said that this is desirable. When there is the proper attitude between teacher and learner, much correction is not irksome. Some learners even desire correction. In so far as theories of education have emphasized such principles as this they have rendered a much needed service. The following factors make it possible to secure correction without punishment: (1) *Identity of purpose between teacher and learner*, as when a boy is preparing for a race and wants every suggestion he can get from his coach, or as when a girl is preparing for a declamation contest and desires every bit of correction her teacher can give her. (2) *Complete confidence in the teacher on the part of the learner*. This spirit is seen in young children during those years when they believe their parents to be omniscient and omnipotent. It would seem to be an unquestioned principle that in this state the more we can teach the child the better. If we could always be sure of competent teachers, it would be well to prolong such a tendency all through the school period. It is lacking too much in our educational life as a whole. (3) *When the learner, aiming at some distant goal, willingly submits himself to correction for the sake of the goal*. The teacher may or may not be conscious of such a decision. The point to be emphasized is that the need of correction is seen by the learner to be essential. It is, as it were, a pruning process in order that the branch may bear more fruit. Many of the truly great men have had the spirit which "welcomes each rebuff" and correction was possible with a minimum of punishment. In a sense such persons punish themselves by purposely undergoing hardships, and self-punishment is always most desirable.

SOME PRINCIPLES OF PUNISHMENT. If the purpose of punishment is to secure some form of correction, it is well to emphasize that punishment must not be carelessly administered. The principles of punishment may be found adequately treated in any book on criminology and penology. (See bibliography). For our purpose only a few of the principles important in moral improvement need be mentioned. (1) *There ought to be some relation between punishment and offense*. Inasmuch as some habits are harder to break than others, a graded system of punishment seems to be required by the very nature of things. (2) *Punishment ought to be administered in such a manner that the offender knows that his reformation is sought*. Those who administer punishment should not give the appearance that they are giving vent to spite or anger. Because of this, many educators advise never to administer corporal punishment until one has had time to gain his equilibrium after being temporarily unbalanced by the shock of the offense. There is much to be said in favor of this view, although there may be times when the pain should be directly connected with the bad deed so that there will never be a tendency to repeat it. (3) *Following punishment there ought to be an opportunity for repentance*. I have found that one of the best ways to secure this is to find some little errand for the child to do. This gives him a chance to show his repentant spirit in a most desirable way. In my experience, this task immediately fol-

lowing punishment has always been done with unusual punctuality and care. The child understands that doing is better than saying, that to show by his work that he is truly sorry is better than to say "I'm sorry." And I believe that it is much better to allow the child to have a few minutes to regain his composure while he is engaged in some task than to force him to make an apology in words which he may not mean. (4) *Where punishment is necessary for the same offense repeatedly, the matter ought to be talked over with the offender and it should be understood that for each offense the penalty is to grow increasingly more painful.* The pain ought to increase drastically with each offense of a serious nature. (5) *There ought to be a frank understanding between the parent or teacher and the child concerning the necessity of punishment.* Children ought to understand that punishment is brought about by their own choices or carelessness. They ought to understand that they "force" their parents to punish them, rather than that their parents are forcing upon them certain arbitrary decisions. A chart showing the nature and frequency of punishment, kept for a period of four years seems to indicate that it is possible to interpret punishment in such a way that the parent receives a minimum of blame and that the child takes the blame to himself. The import fact is that punishment is not necessarily followed by a period of estrangement and despondency.

Many other questions arise regarding punishment. Should one administer corporal punishment in the presence of others? When should corporal punishment be preferred to other kinds? The writer feels that such questions can be properly answered only by those who are dealing with a given situation. On the whole, punishment in public is rarely necessary if it has previously been administered when necessary in private. Any physician knows that a child who obeys habitually takes its medicine in time of sickness. In most cases it may be said that physical punishment may be administered with profit in the presence of others if the parent or teacher has himself wholly under control. Such procedure may be just what the child needs to help him break a bad habit. It is difficult to know when corporal punishment is preferable to some other form. Three principles seem worthy of consideration: (1) The failure of other methods of punishment; (2) the necessity for immediate pain; (3) the individual responses to punishment of the child.

The first of these principles implies that corporal punishment is to be preserved as a kind of ultimatum. The writer believes that in the ordinary circumstances of family life, this is its best use. However, many parents have used it almost exclusively with such good results that one can not dogmatically say that it ought never to be resorted to. Some object to physical punishment because it is the worst possible means of conveying love to the child. The answer to this objection is, in the first place, that the purpose of punishment is not to convey love; and in the second place under certain circumstances the parent can thus best show his regard for the child's welfare. But if one uses corporal punishment for all offenses almost exclusively, he must be careful not to grow into the habit of inflicting so little pain that the child soon prefers to sin with the punishment rather than to be good without it. Anybody who has seen a country woman drive a horse, constantly pelting him with the whip while the horse blissfully chooses his own gait, has a good example of how constant whipping loses its efficacy unless it is administered wisely and severely. One should not whip often. But when it is done, its severity ought to be remembered for weeks. So far as corporal punishment's estranging the child from the parent is concerned, it cannot be established as a fact. If the parents

and children have a loving, wholesome, family spirit, corporal punishment brings no estrangement. If such a spirit does not pervade the family life, any kind of punishment begets estrangement. In all probability, cases of temporary rage, due to drunkenness or anger, have brought corporal punishment into disrepute. But it must still be kept for (a) those who do not respond to other forms of punishment; and (b) for those who occasionally need a more drastic form of punishment than is being meted out habitually.

In the second place, corporal punishment is sometimes desirable when immediate pain must be inflicted. There are times when one cannot allow a period of pleasant experience to elapse between a serious misdeed and the requisite punishment. If a child has the habit of running into the street where automobiles are wont to go, he must be dealt with immediately. Corporal punishment serves here as the best corrective measure known to the writer. It ought to be administered severely and promptly so that the stimulus "I believe I will run across the street" will be followed immediately by the response "If I do I shall get a good sound whipping, so I will not do it." There are many situations in life comparable with this situation as far as basic principles are involved. For most children at given times, and for some children at most times, the thought "if I do I shall get a sound whipping" probably has more inhibitive influence than "mother doesn't want me to." Unless it can be shown that this is not true, corporal punishment is not only to be retained in the list of possible forms of punishment; but it is to be called one of the essential forms for certain types of behavior. Its value is due to the child's instinctive fear of a larger, more powerful being and the fear of pain. Because it begets fear—inhibitory fear—in the heart of the offender, it is reliable and effective. Of course, each parent and teacher ought to have a well-defined conception of what the misdeeds are which need immediate and drastic punishment. Intuition is not a certain guide. Especially parents ought to know each other's attitudes and in so far as possible they ought to agree on the kind and intensity of punishment. The question of favoritism will be dealt with elsewhere. Suffice it to say here that it is not wholesome for the child to think that one of the parents is "easy" while the other is "stern" or "cranky." Perhaps the same principle applies in the school system.

The third aspect of corporal punishment, the individual responses of the child to punishment, is most difficult. Some children have a nervous system so sensitive to bodily pain that corporal punishment is probably too severe. It tends to create a temporary insanity and thus defeats its own purpose. Wise parents can soon discover such a tendency. After children have been through serious illness, or if they have suffered some terrible fright, they may be hyper-sensitive to physical punishment. In all such cases some other punishment must be used. But some children refuse to take seriously any other form of punishment. Often the parents who pride themselves because they have never whipped their children would fail to get the sanction of their neighbors. When the average boy gets so strong that he holds his mother's wrists when she attempts to strap him, he needs a good trouncing by his father. Like all chastening, it would seem grievous at the time, but it might be a turning point in the boy's life. There is reason to believe that prisons contain boys who needed one more good whipping which they failed to get.

On the whole, girls need corporal punishment less than boys. Most girls can be punished sufficiently by other methods. Many girls, however, "work" their parents by affectionate coddling. They appeal to the sympathies of the

parent by making it appear that any punishment is cruel and that their girl friends do not suffer such indignities. In such cases strict discipline is necessary, and corporal punishment may bring such girls to their senses at once and may keep them in proper subordination to the wishes and will of their parents. At least it seems most unwise to let a girl believe that, come what will, she will never be whipped. To say the least, such a procedure on the part of the parent is dangerous.

The conclusion, about corporal punishment, is this: Use it wisely and discreetly whenever it is needed. The parent or the teacher must study the children until it is known when and where and how to punish them. No general rules can be laid down. On the whole, corporal punishment ought to be severely administered; and, because of this, delicate children, or children temporarily in a delicate state of health, should probably not receive corporal punishment unless all other forms fail. Those who have succeeded in training children without corporal punishment err in believing that all parents could do so. Such parents probably represent a small minority. The great mass of parents find corporal punishment necessary and beneficial.

THE KNOWLEDGE OF PENALTIES. Our government has proceeded on the assumption that it is fair to give the individual some idea concerning what punishment he may expect for each kind of misdemeanor. It would be difficult to say dogmatically that this is either wise or unwise. In some cases it is quite evident that it is unwise, for the offender deliberately breaks the law because the profit accruing to him by so doing is far greater than the punishment administered in case he is caught—and of course there is always the chance that he will not be caught. In the case of children in the home or school-room, there seems on the whole to be no objection to having it rather clearly understood that certain behavior calls for certain punishment. Most bad behavior falls under ten or twelve general types, so that both the parent and the child know pretty well what to expect in such matters. But having granted that previous knowledge of the penalties is permissible, there are other factors to be considered.

(1) First, it is harmful to lead the child to suppose that a certain punishment for a certain deed is absolutely fixed. He ought always to understand that the parent or teacher may change his mind. In fact, he ought to be absolutely sure that the parent or teacher will change his mind if there is any evidence that the punishment is too slight. One of the weaknesses of our present-day penal system lies just here: the law fixes penalties which allow men to break it and still make large profits. Such a practice in the home or school almost inevitably betokens moral failure. (2) In the second place knowledge of the nature and extent of the punishment may serve as a restraining influence. This, in reality, is the chief justification for issuing such knowledge. Every legitimate form of restraining influence ought to be introduced into the child's environment until he learns to do right for right's own sake. (3) In the third place, knowledge of the punishment for certain sins gives some indication of their heinousness. This the child should know as early as possible. Nothing is more sobering than the knowledge that there are sins which can be tolerated under no circumstances.

THE ELEMENT OF FEAR IN PUNISHMENT. We shall discuss this question under three questions: (1) Is it justifiable; (2) is it efficacious; (3) how can it be controlled?

(1) In discussing the element of fear in punishment we are forced back

upon historical schemes for control of behavior, where we find that some phase of fear has always been relied on. In ancient religious beliefs and forms, fear played a great part. In the Old Testament, Jehovah is to be feared above all the gods. Even the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. The Lord might at any moment cause the earth to swallow up the wicked. He controlled the forces of nature for such purposes and could use them at any time. In Greek and Roman mythology and religion, Jupiter was a mighty god chiefly because he was to be feared when he was angry.

Regardless of our ancestry, from the ancient past such beliefs have come down to us, and to-day these same conceptions of deity, changed somewhat in form, but the same in essence, dwell in the popular mind.

Not only in religion but in the State the element of fear has been present. Rulers were to be feared. They had authority—usually divine. They could command and execute. Lispering babes were taught to fear the king as well as to honor him. There is reason to believe that they were taught to honor the king because he was to be feared. Even the family was patterned along these lines. The father was to be feared for his sternness. Parental obedience was unquestioned and filial disrespect was paid for with the death penalty. There can be no doubt that the ancients depended much upon fear as a means of controlling behavior. Through fear, the tabu became effective. Through fear men and children obeyed. Through fear the subject did obeisance to the king.

In modern times the element of fear has been somewhat lessened. (a) The church does not stress fear as it formerly did. Men are not, in such drastic terms and methods, forced into the Kingdom of God to escape the burning, sizzling hell of Jonathan Edwards' conception. So much is this true that some feel that the church has lost her "authority" largely because men no longer fear the eternal punishment in hell. Without fear, some think that men will not take seriously the eternal values of life. (b) In education more stress has been put upon the winsomeness and efficiency of the teacher than upon his awesomeness. No longer does the teacher depend upon the rod, but upon his ability to interest his pupils. Pupils do not fear the teacher. In some cases the teacher fears the pupils. They may band together and oust him if things do not go well. The element of fear is not as prominent in education as it was in the past. (c) In civil affairs fear is not as strong as it formerly was. Men no longer fear the processes of the law. Whereas formerly only the rough element openly evaded the law, now the respected classes tend, more and more, to evade legal requirements and by shrewd scheming which, while known, is difficult to punish.

From this brief summary, we see that there is little in history to show whether fear is justifiable or not as a means of restraint. We only know that it has been employed, and that at present it is not as potent as formerly in our own national life. We might point out that fear of might has been the deciding factor in inter-group relations and that even to-day fear of military supremacy is a disquieting factor in international life. Our conclusion concerning the justifiability of fear gets little foundation in history. Perhaps we should ask what the effects of fear have been. What are the fruits of fear? Though we wish that men would do right for the sake of the right; and that they would shun evil because it is evil, we still may ask if, until such a time, fear may not be used. (1) Fear is efficacious in its restraining influences. Men have shunned evil because they feared hell. Children have refrained from evil because they

feared parental punishment. Students have studied because they feared the consequences of not studying. Men have worked because they feared the pangs of poverty. Young people have refrained from sexual intimacies because they feared ostracism. From this standpoint, fear has been helpful. If we ask whether it is wholesome for persons to remain in this state of fear, we are not so certain. Perhaps it is not. If we believe the modern psycho-analysts we are assured that fear is always harmful—if man can do away with it he may be complete master of his environment. But granted that a constant state of fear in men's minds, is to some degree unwholesome, we still have to ask if this sense of fear is not better than wrong-doing. Men in the past have felt that fear was to be preferred to evil. Parents therefore did not hesitate to instill fear into their children. It was considered a safeguard.

(2) The relation of fear to enlightenment is important. Can we hope to rely upon fear if we educate people? The answer to this is both "yes" and "no." As the child grows older he loses his earlier sense of fear of punishment. But through a process of education he can be led to see why his parents forbade certain practices. He may be led to see that they feared vicariously for him. Now that he understands the causal relations himself, he no longer fears his parents, but the effects of certain practices. This is the ideal toward which all fear-inspiring influences ought to work.

(3) Fear of evil consequences is not only justifiable but necessary. If the child can be led to this fear, he has been well educated. The only thing which a well educated person ought to fear is error of wrong-doing of any kind. Hence the element of fear is justifiable, especially if it leads the child to fear the results of evil living. The student may well fear the consequences of carelessness, the boy may well fear the consequences of dissipation, the girl may well fear the consequences of incontinence. To instill such fear should be one of the goals of education.

2. IS FEAR EFFICACIOUS? This question has already been partially answered. Fear governs conduct to some degree because: (1) pain is anticipated before it is experienced and inhibition is made easier; (2) fear tends to abide in the consciousness until it is expelled through enlightenment or practice—hence it is an ever present factor in restraint. Other points might be mentioned, but these will suffice. The eleventh chapter of Hebrews cites what marvelous things have been done by faith; another chapter might be written about the wonderful things that have been accomplished by fear. Through it rulers have subdued kingdoms, waxed wealthy and mighty, established dynasties, tyrannically oppressed their subjects. One may ask if any other force has been more forceful in shaping the destinies of the race. (a) Fear of being caught makes the unsuspected criminal give himself up. (b) Fear of social neglect makes people mortgage their homes for the sake of wasteful luxuries. (c) Fear of being permanently single makes a young woman lay aside her native shyness in order that she may attract more effectively the attention of young men. (d) Fear of the prison keeps a man from stealing the money which he needs. (e) Fear of death makes people cling to physicians and medicines. (f) Fear of eternal punishment makes men piously religious when otherwise they would prefer to participate freely in these activities which through fear they are led to renounce. There seemingly is no realm of one's life where fear does not operate either to impel one to action or to restrain him from action.

3. HOW CAN FEAR BE CONTROLLED? The physician attempts to control fear by suggesting hopeful thoughts. The patient is led to believe that he is

not in such a dangerous condition as he thinks. Others in worse condition than he have recovered. The parent attempts to remove fear by convincing the child that always it is the child's welfare that is sought and not the will of the parent. The teacher attempts to expel fear by close contact with the pupil so that the element of strangeness is done away with. But these same persons may wish to instill fear. The physician may make his impetuous patient feel that his danger is very grave and much to be feared, the parent may make the child fearful that he will receive the most cruel punishment, the teacher may by means of threats "scare" the pupil into studying. Fear can be removed or instilled, within certain limits, at the will of the parent or teacher.

On the whole, however, it is difficult to control fear. Perhaps only a few fears are worth establishing in the child's mind. *The fear of error, the fear of injuring others, the fear of failing to be his best, these are the only permanent fears to be recommended. Temporarily it may be well for the child to fear the parent's or teacher's disapproval, but soon he must be led to fear his own failures.*

CORRECTION AND FATIGUE. Fatigue is both specific and general. When it is specific, a change of activity or interest will bring about the same result as complete rest. But sometimes fatigue is general. So much energy has been spent upon one activity that one's entire store of energy for the time being is depleted. At such times the child is not responsible for his actions. He loses control of himself. His disobedience, for example, ought not to be counted as seriously as if it occurred at times when fatigue is not present. In matters of correction, especially at home, it is well to keep the laws of fatigue in mind. Frequently the child is expected to improve when he is tired, and improvement is impossible. This often makes the ignorant parent feel that his authority is being questioned and punishment follows when the child is least responsible for his actions. Such treatment if long continued tends to build up undesirable attitudes in the child.

Parents should see to it that children get plenty of sleep, for sleep is the best cure for fatigue. As night approaches the problem of disobedience often increases because the child is worn out and loses self-control. He gives vent to his feelings because his power to inhibit has been lessened.

As much as possible children should not be punished when they are tired. Wise parents understand this principle. A crying child at a night performance indicates a foolish mother rather than a naughty child. To spank the child under such circumstances is worse than useless, for it makes the child hate the parent without making him want to quit crying. Of course, one cannot measure fatigue accurately. But one can usually tell when the child is nearing the point of exhaustion. At this time leniency and patience are the proper corrective principles until the child can rest. Probably hunger has much the same influence as fatigue; and the same cautions should be observed in regard to it.

CORRECTION AND GUIDANCE BY SUGGESTION. Many teachers have profited by Froebel's method of teaching desirable courses of action largely by suggestion. In correction it is well to tell the child what to do as well as what not to do. To forbid one activity without suggesting another is to leave the child in doubt regarding what is permissible. Of course this principle must be used with caution or else it is a whip in the child's hand to control the teacher. On the whole, suggestion is a valuable aid to controlling constructively the child's conduct. (a) Suppose the child wants to cut paper with scissors. It is well to

suggest that he cut out pictures, that he make a paper house, etc. This stimulates and directs his mind and yet leaves him free to express himself in his own way. If such a method is not used, the child may aimlessly cut whatever happens to catch his eye. He may destroy something of value. This principle is that of *unconscious direction*. (b) Again, suppose that the child has a habit of banging the door. The parent may suggest to him that it would be much nicer to shut the door quietly. Or the parent may suggest that they have a door-shutting contest. Each one is to go through the house and open and shut every door. The one who shuts all the doors most quietly wins the game. In many situations, it will pay the parent to take the time to suggest better behavior by imitation. (c) When a child is cross because of physical indisposition, it is well to suggest some activity or consuming interest. There are always two or three things the child likes to do above all others. The parent ought to know what these interesting things are and suggest them at those times when the child seems helpless to direct his own efforts. (d) In the common situations which arise in family life such as boisterousness, scuffling, carelessness, discourtesy, etc., suggestions regarding what kind of behavior such acts will produce if they become habits are forceful. Through the repetition of these suggestions again and again, the child's behavior is permanently influenced.

Rules for the method of suggestion are unnecessary. Parents and teachers who understand the value of the method must learn how and when to use it. It is only *one* educational method and should be used with discretion. One of its chief values is that it often prevents crises and conflicts which demand punishment.

SOME SIMPLE PRINCIPLES.

- 1—Correct the child before his wrong acts become habitual.
- 2—Correct him whenever possible by giving him an example.
- 3—Use the method of suggestion whenever possible.
- 4—Do not threaten punishment. Inflict it.
- 7—Explain why certain actions are prohibited.
- 6—Avoid issues which are sure to lead to a crisis if possible.
- 7—Distinguish between accidental and intentional misdemeanors.
- 8—Avoid letting the child become hungry and fatigued.
- 9—Appeal to the child's sense of loyalty and honor, helping him to develop a family spirit.
- 10—Show a genuine love for and interest in the child by working and playing with him. Comradeship does away with the need for much correction.

CONCLUSION. Since correction is one of the chief functions of education—and, therefore, of the parent and teacher—a definite aim in correction ought to exist in the mind of every person who is responsible for the education of children. As much as possible correction ought to be secured by the voluntary striving of the individual to improve. Where this method fails, some form of punishment must be applied. The form of punishment depends upon many factors, some of which are (a) nature of the offense, (b) the particular temperament of the child, (c) the circumstances under which the offense has been committed. The inflicting of punishment is of such a nature that one cannot state dogmatically what ought to be done in specific cases. The parent or teacher, however, who has carefully studied the matter will know what to do when definite situations arise much better than if there has been no such thoughtful preparation.

In the whole question of correction, the chief function of the teacher or parent is to get the individual to desire to improve. Until this is accomplished, little has been done. Consequently, only parents and teachers who really have the welfare of the individual at heart will be very successful in correcting him.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF GAMES TO MORAL EDUCATION

Chapter VII

NECESSITY OF PLAY. Each child faces a conflict of desires due to the fact that he is born with a set of instinctive impulses which do not fit him to live in a world planned wholly for adults. He has a set of desires which fit him for a life of liberty; but he is expected to live by a set of rules which seem to restrain him at almost every point. The instinctive nature of the child is not well suited to modern urban life. Modern city life puts so many restraints upon the children and gives them so few opportunities to follow their original tendencies that it is surprising that juvenile delinquency does not reach much larger proportions.

Many educators err in over-emphasizing the child's plastic nature. It is doubtful if the child should be called plastic at all. He is not like putty. He is a being who has active impulses which are ever ready to assert themselves. These tendencies are so strong that frequently the adult finds it necessary to give way to the child's wishes. The whole trend in modern education to discover how the native impulses of children can be utilized is an admission that the child is anything but plastic. He is educable, to be sure, but before he yields he sometimes puts up a stubborn fight which suggests anything but plasticity. Play is a necessity. We must allow the child to follow his instinctive desires for action. He simply must act. His nature forbids passivity and indifference. Because of his natural instincts the child is certain to be active and it is for society to say whether his activities shall be legal or illegal. If proper care is given to the needs of the child, all his play tendencies can be brought under control. Otherwise early in life he becomes the child criminal because his instinctive play nature has not had proper channels of expression. If a boy cannot play in one way, he will in another. If, for example, he cannot go out into the open to annoy and tease and spar with his playmates, he is certain to pick on the corner groceryman or even on the policeman who seems to the boy to take delight in spoiling all the fun of boys in general.

SOME INSTINCTS TO BE RECKONED WITH. Lee¹ believes there are seven, principal play instincts. His list includes: creation, rhyme, hunting, fighting-nurture, curiosity, team play. Thorndike² and others list more. For our purpose we shall not attempt to distinguish between a pure instinct and some particular manifestation of an instinct. For example, we shall not attempt to differentiate between the act "throwing at some object" and the hunting instinct. It is evident that throwing belongs to the group of actions which are manifestations of the hunting instinct. Also the inquisitive and acquisitive groups of actions are regarded by some writers as instinctive. So also are such actions as climbing, self-adornment, and the tendency to flee from a large moving object. Of course the instincts of self-preservation, of race preservation and of imitation—the tendency to try to do what one sees others do—must be included in any list of instincts.³

All such instincts must be reckoned with. To repress them is to dehumanize the child. To make use of them is to produce enthusiasm, virility and earnestness toward accomplishing the highest human goals. It would seem that we

1. Lee, Joseph, *Play in Education*, McMillan, 1917. p. 13.

2. Thorndike, Edward L., *Educational Psychology, Briefer Course*, Columbia Univ., New York, 1917.

3. For typical lists of instincts which are important in education, see appendix at the end of this chapter.

have in large measure ordered our civilization backwards. Civilization ought to plan for the welfare of the child rather than that of the adult. Houses and yards and streets and schools and even cities ought to be planned so as to give the child the greatest possible opportunity to follow out his instinctive desires for action.

The adult should not repress so much as to seek to control the child's instinctive actions. In this way he can work with the child and the child will furnish the necessary enthusiasm and initiative.

THE ORGANIZATION OF GAMES. Games should be centered around some basic instinct. Hide and seek, for example, has always been popular because it is built around the hunting instinct and gives opportunity to act in accord with the hunting-activities such as peeping, locating the hunted object, creeping, listening, attempting to outrun, etc. Modern play enthusiasts are constantly enriching the play life of children by increasing the number of games, many of which have high moral and educational values.

(1) *Hunting without intent to destroy or kill.* A part of primitive hunting was to locate the prey. We can appropriate at least this aspect of the hunting instinct in many ways. (a) We can have a group of children hunt for flowers in the spring, each one calling "I spy" when he finds one. (b) We can hunt with a camera, creeping up on the rare birds, snap a mother bird feeding her young, get a picture of the eagle as he takes off in flight, secure a picture of the wild-geese on the pond, etc. A collection of such pictures for the school room would be of much educational interest and worth. (c) We can hunt for trees, for birds, for rocks, for different kinds of soil and list the names in a notebook. (d) We can hunt for the springs, for the caves, for the shade-trees, for the camping places in each community. (e) We can hunt for the wild animals and insects, classifying them according to their utility or their destructiveness.

(2) *Fighting without intent to injure.* The essence of fighting is to match both strength and skill. This can be done in a variety of ways such as by: (a) tugs of war, (b) pulling on a stick, (c) pushing with arm akimbo. (d) competitive games such as football where physical contact is necessary, but always without intentional injury. Games centered around the fighting instinct are usually strenuous. The players often are completely exhausted because their enthusiasm has outlasted their strength. This suggests that if the right attitudes are associated with such games, the educative value will be great because the interest is so keen.

(3) *Fighting to protect.* Children like to champion a cause or guard a position or a person. This native impulse can be turned into many useful and helpful channels. Children can be enlisted to protect the song birds by fighting off their enemies. They can be led to protect helpless animals from other animals or from cruel children. They can be led to protect plant life from destructive animals such as moles and other burrowing animals. It is not unreasonable to suppose that this desire can also be used to off-set the teasing instinct so that children can be influenced always to fight for that which needs protection. Boys can be led to fight for smaller boys, or for girls. Possibly this interest can be interpreted so that in later life these same persons will fight for laws which protect child-laborers, factory workers and all who are oppressed.

(4) *Imitation in good behavior.* Games in which imitation is the chief motive are most fascinating. "Dare-devil" and "Follow-the-leader" are usually popular games unless they are supervised so closely that they lose their native thrilling qualities. The writer has used with good results the same kind

of interest in behavior. The method of procedure is simple. Select one or two children who excel in some act of behavior. Suppose that John is especially tidy. Then John becomes the "leader." All the others try for a week to be as tidy as John. If at the end of the week some have surpassed him, then they become leaders. Such situations can be multiplied indefinitely by the resourceful teacher. An added spur in all such activities is afforded by the instinct of rivalry. Under competition children will expend the utmost energies. Some teachers of handwork have secured remarkable results in improvement and skill by appealing to a combination of the imitative and competitive instincts.

A whole book could be written on this theme. We can only show the possibilities of such an interpretation of games. The playgrounds of the public schools are most important and each school should have at least one person who is especially prepared to guide the play activities of the children along creative and constructive lines.

MORAL GOALS IN GAMES. Games make up an important part in the child's experiences, and must, therefore, have a marked influence upon him. How can we turn this influence in positive directions? We shall discuss the game attitudes and game interests as they are related to morality.

(1) The desire to excel is prominent in games. This is usually discussed under the competitive instinct. Whatever the function of this desire might have been in primitive life, where it undoubtedly was accompanied by willingness to exterminate the opponent, in most games it does not go beyond the mere desire to excel, the desire to win. It is on the whole a laudable desire. It gives the foundation for personal initiative, without which even the moral educator finds himself helpless. The danger is that it may carry along with it the subordinate desire to injure the opponent in order to make doubly sure that the prime desire to excel will be satisfied. If games can be used to arouse the desire to excel, they call forth the utmost exertion from the members of the group and are thus laudable whips or spurs to efficiency. The teacher or parent can manipulate things so that there is really an altruistic spirit in such contests, as can be shown in cases where all engaged really desire that the side having the highest ability will win. This may be somewhat definitely controlled in many schoolroom contests where only mental activity comes into play. If the groups are changed frequently, there is not the tendency to form cliques and groups which may destroy the democratic spirit which is so desirable in the schoolroom.

If two groups are contending to see which group can have the best attendance, or the best lessons, or be the most courteous, then the moral significance of the group-desire to excel is evident. While the child may grow lax as soon as the games end or the contests close, nevertheless he has been taught most vividly that the purposes of the contests were in themselves laudable. So games may be made to teach the children what the desirable attitudes and acts are.

(2) Games may be used in such a manner that a third party receives benefit, regardless of which side wins, as is the case where two groups compete to make the most clothes for an orphanage, or sell the most tickets to a performance for the maintenance of the hospital. Here the principle of the game has been turned to what we may call altruistic ends. The only reward is the honor in presenting the prize to a disinterested party. In manifold ways such modifications may be made of games that they come to have teaching

value. Of course, if this matter is overdone, even young children soon lose interest for they discover that the game is being used not alone for its intrinsic merit, but as a kind of tool or agency. But such uses of games, within reasonable bounds, seem legitimate from the standpoint of moral education. (3) A third game-interest which may be utilized is that of fairness. The game has rules which must be respected. Not to do so brings personal shame and group injury and penalty. Therefore it is possible to use games to emphasize the social nature of wrong-doing. If one cheats, the whole "side" is judged guilty. Furthermore, nothing breaks up relations between two groups so quickly as dishonesty. The moral inference is plain: fair dealings and honesty are the ways for two groups to get along without strife and friction. This aspect is important, for it is not opposed to competition, but only against unfair competition. (4) Under proper supervision, games may be used as the practice periods for moral training. Suppose such lessons as honesty, fairness, courtesy, truthfulness are being taught in connection with lessons either in school, church, or home. Then games may be arranged so that to tell the truth will be a disadvantage and to lie an advantage. Hence a real temptation is put to the children in the form of a game and the participants must face issues which are essentially moral. The practice thus gained is valuable, both while the game lasts and during the immediate after-effects when the discussion of any moral breaches are being engaged in by the player.

SUPERVISION OF GAMES. Recently, most educators claim that play ought to be supervised by an older person. The feeling is that there will be less cheating and bullying if an adult acts as supervisor and arbiter. Unquestionably this is true. One may ask, however, what the effect of game supervision has been. In large measure supervision turns the game from play into work, though of course this depends much upon the amount of good-will the supervisor may have. The chief value of a supervisor, however, is not to act as a policeman, but to plan situations in games so that manliness and altruism will be rewarded and that meanness and trickery will be punished. The supervisor should look upon his task as a constructive one; one which creates situations out of which strength of character will eventually come. This is merely a form of teaching, and because interest is at its height, the supervisor can hope for large results. There is a stable moral element in true sportsmanship, and the supervisor who understands the art of developing the spirit of sportsmanship is one of the community's chief assets. The supervisor should understand the vicious elements which are apt to manifest themselves in games. The most important of these are: anger, jealousy, cruelty, cheating, and bullying.

All games which tend to exalt cruelty ought either to be modified or eliminated. Football is a questionable game from this consideration. There is the tendency to harm and hurt the opponent. If one learns lifelong moral principles in games, as so many claim, then football must be carefully supervised. Especially for younger children, baseball and other "open games" are much more preferable; because there is not such a temptation to resort to personal combat with all its accompanying attitudes and emotions. In short, the supervisor ought to be both a promoter of games, and a promoter of human welfare. Games are merely the tools with which he works. If this is true, then he need not be a big-chested, gigantic man; but rather a man with keen intellect and deep understanding. Only men with these characteristics and with such ideals of service are fit to supervise the games of children or to coach athletic

teams. To magnify the purely physical aspects of the game above those of morality and manhood makes of it a debasing influence.

GAMES AND GALLANTRY. It is possible that games may be a means of instructing the youth in the principles of gallantry. It is a tedious process with many children to inhibit the boisterous, rude characteristics and to take on the characteristics of gentility and refinement. Two things ought to be said here, however, which deserve the attention of all who use games as a means of developing character: (1) One must not be too hasty in supposing that outward marks of gentility are synonymous with inner integrity and refinement. (2) Much that is boisterous and rude in younger children will disappear in time through their own conscious imitation. But there is such a thing as genuine gallantry, true gentility. Jesus seemed to have possessed it. It comes from genuine love for others, together with the desire to please and help them. When games can be manipulated so that they contribute to such genuine expressions of character as kindness, courtesy, forbearance, clean speech, pleasantness, and gentleness, then games have been made to contribute much to morality.

TYPICAL EVIL PRINCIPLES IN GAMES. Of course all games may serve the wills of those who play them by a slight change in the rules or by a shift of emphasis. Suppose we take five common games played by boys to illustrate some of the evil principles. (1) In the game of marbles, playing for "keeps" is not to be recommended. It does not mean that the boy, when grown, will steal; because playing "keeps" is not stealing. It is unfair competition. It takes away the opponent's opportunity to maintain himself. The point system in marbles should be established, or else a full restoration should be made at the end of the game if "keeps" is played. (2) Spinning tops gives boys either an opportunity for skill in placing the top, or in splitting the opponent's top. When boys prepare tops designed to split the tops of other boys and thus throw the other boys out of the game, it is another example of winning by injuring the opponent. (3) In running, boys are apt to try to "beat the gun." Some coaches train them at this practice. The thought here is not to win by injury or loss, but by unfair and unnoticed advantage. The suggestion the runner gets is that it is all right if he can "get by with it." (4) In football it is quite common for one team to "choose out" one or two players on the opposing team and either tire them out or injure them. Usually the best players are singled out. Here, again, is the idea of winning by injury. It is the lowest possible conception of sport. True sportsmanship demands of every sportsman that in case of doubt he give his opponent the advantage. (5) In baseball, there is a tendency to scheme so that the attention of the umpire will be diverted while a runner purposely fouls. Such practices are especially vicious because they are not the result of enthusiasm and excitement, but are premeditated. Often the spectators applaud such trickery, mistaking it for sportsmanship. Educators should recognize that all games admit of trickery. To speak of football or baseball as being great socializing games may be misleading. Do we mean that such games always produce desirable influences on the players? It is obvious that such games may produce the most corrupting influences on the players. It is noteworthy that the morality of professional athletes is not especially high, and the moral record of many college athletes is not one of which the colleges can be proud. If games of themselves produced moral virtues, our problem would be simple. As it is, games furnish only an important activity by which we may strongly influence behavior. Trickery in all games should be eliminated. The child learns by imitation, by instruction, by participation.

If he sees trickery, if he is instructed in trickery, if he participates in trickery in his games, in all probability he will practice it all through life. The supervision of games requires persons of keen perception, high moral standards and a personality which commands respect.

PERMANENT VALUE OF GAME ETHICS. We have not yet discovered any satisfactory method of measuring the relative influences of one phase of the environment in contrast with another. If we could do so we should doubtless find that the ethics of games become in large measure the ethics of business. The way we act on the playground is the way we act during our lifetime. If we cheated there when no one could detect us, we are probably doing the same thing now. If we were bold enough to cheat openly then, we are probably bold enough to do so now. Of course we must not be narrowly dogmatic. The influences of the playground are doubtless modified in later life in many ways. But for the most part the ethical standards of the boy of sixteen will be the ethical standards of the same individual when he has lived twenty years longer. His friends who knew him as a boy will believe they know him in the future. If he was "tricky" then, they will suspect him. If he was fair and just then, they will still have confidence in him. While such inferences are not conclusive, they serve to call our attention to the importance of high ideals in all play-life.

Those games which afford temptations are to be recommended. Successfully withstanding temptation is the road which leads to character. But teachers and parents should do all within their power to help the children keep the ethics of the playground as free as possible from the polluting influences of selfish advantage and spiteful intrigue. If we could secure absolute control of the games and play-life of all the children now under eight years of age, we could, in the course of a few years, produce a generation with higher moral standards than we have yet known or dreamed of.

APPENDIX

Typical Lists of Important Instincts

Pyle, Willam Henry, *The Outlines of Educational Psychology*, First Edition. Baltimore, Warwick, and York, 1911. Fear, Pugnacity, Gregariousness, Migratory, Collecting, Play, Imitation. (See chapters 5-9)

Also in the same book in the appendix on page 246 in a list of instincts given together with the approximate dates of their appearances and the names of the investigators such as Kirkpatrick, Major, Preyer, Sully, Dearborn, Darwin, Burk.

Thorndike, Edward L., *Educational Psychology, Briefer Course*, New York, Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1917. First Ed. Acquisition and Possession, Hunting, Fear, Fighting, Gregariousness, Rivalry, Ownership, Kindliness, Teasing, Imitation. Chapters 2-3.

Coe, George Albert, *Social Theory of Religious Education*. First Ed. New York, Charles Scribner's sons, 1917. p. 122-124. Simple Gregariousness, Special interest in what is being done by human beings: Wanting to be noticed by human beings; Craving for approval from other human beings, and discomfort from their disapproval; Approval or admiration not only for those who are useful to us, but also for those who exhibit strength, daring or beauty; and disapproval, scorn, or disgust for persons of the opposite sorts, even though they have not injured us; Effort to master others, particularly weaker animals and human beings and to subdue them if they resist; but also readiness to submit to the strong or self-assertive individual; Rivalry; Hunting; Anger and Pugnacity; Sex attraction; Parental regard; The kind of imitativeness that produces crowd action.

THE MORAL INFLUENCES OF WORK

Chapter VIII

WORK AND PLAY. These two terms do not represent different types of physical or mental exertions, but rather attitudes accompanying such exertion. What is work to-day may be turned to play, and what is play may soon become work. In the present discussion we are not interested primarily in the physical aspects of work. We are interested chiefly in the moral influences of work. As we look forward to a society that will be increasingly influenced by mechanical means of conveyance which will lessen the natural physical activities, we realize that work is an important factor in the life of a sedentary people. This problem, however, is one for the physiologist who must explain the detrimental effects of an inactive life; or for the sociologist, who must show the effects of a sedentary life upon group thought and action. Our interest is in how we may use work to secure right moral and social attitudes, how we can get people to make right responses to work so that the effects will be beneficial.

NATURE OF WORK. Among primitive peoples work is confined largely to food-getting and clothes-making, plus a few other activities which are essential to the simple life of the group. But in complex societies many persons do not work directly for their food and clothes and other comforts. Their work may not be physical at all. They may be poets, or musicians, or artists. Mental work, then, has an increasing place in a complex society. Moreover, since the producer and consumer are no longer able to sell and buy directly, persons known as "middle-men" or agents attempt to bring seller and buyer together. Whoever renders any service to his fellow men, whether as producer of food, clothes, comforts, luxuries or whoever is a producer of art or literature or music; or whoever teaches or preaches, or furnishes ideals for society; or whoever acts as agent for others is a worker. While there is nothing new about this, it is necessary for us to recognize clearly what work is, in order that we may be consistent when we deal with children. Work, in all its manifold forms, is an important factor in life. While it implies some kind of exertion, it does not always imply what we call "physical" exertion. Nor does it always imply exertion for personal gain or for money, because men may exert themselves altruistically for the sake of others where there is no gain, or men may exert themselves in the fine arts; for example, for the sheer pleasure of beauty and harmony.

(1) *One's work reveals to some extent his nature.* The product of one's work shows whether he is careful or careless, whether he is accurate or inaccurate, whether he is conscientious or unconscientious, whether he is patient or impatient, whether he is honest or dishonest. For centuries men have recognized this fact, but its application to moral training has been much neglected. Such a consideration of work has many virtues so far as mental attitudes are concerned. For example, the man who realizes that his work reveals his own nature seldom feels it to be a burden. He rather feels that his work is a means of proving his own inherent worth. It is his means of making his mark in the world so that men will know he has lived. It thus saves a man from being a mere slave to whom work is drudgery; it ennobles all his work; and though it be performed amidst the lowliest of circumstances, the work itself is respected by him because each piece of work represents so much of personality in concrete form. Work also reveals thought, willingness, ability, temperament and individuality. It is the medium through which one man speaks to

others. It reveals something of the very core and fibre of the man himself. It thus tends to give meaning to knowledge and experience by putting knowledge and experience to constructive and creative uses. Finally, work tends to make a man feel his identity with his fellow men who profit by his work; and also to feel that he is a part of the cosmic life processes. Because he creates and contributes something of himself, he somehow feels that he thus becomes a part of Life Universal. He leaves behind him "footprints" which make walking easier for others. He lives in hearts he leaves behind and so does not really die. By his own creative energies he has become a part of the whole of life. While such an attitude may seem to be mystical and irrational, it is significant that such an attitude on the part of workmen has given to the world not only some of its greatest art, music and literature, but it has also produced some of the rarest souls. Each of the "arts" and each of the "sciences" has had its "unknown" devotees who have given their lives for the sake of the work; and though unappreciated at the time, the world now calls them great. There are also those who are known to have suffered untold hardships, but whose work was nobly done. The moral effects of such a conception are: (a) A consuming desire and purpose in the consciousness which gives steadiness and direction to all the individual's actions. (b) That such a conception becomes an antidote against sheer laziness in which the mind is diverted to lower planes of achievement, thus insuring a normal active life. (c) That it furnishes to other men a pattern of good workmanship, whether it be mental or physical, and thus helps to establish high ideals in others, becoming a force for social morality. If we but knew it, the good workmen in a community are to be counted as great assets because they are good examples. All inferior workmen contribute to degrading conceptions of work, service and morality.

(2) *Work may be considered a means of securing independence so that one may the better develop himself and serve his fellow men.* In days of personal struggle and combat, to have superior physical strength was a great blessing not only because of the self-protective ability, but also because one could thus help others. Likewise it is possible to conceive of work as securing for one a kind of economic independence so that he is the freer to follow out the inclinations of his inner nature for fellowship and for helpfulness. Many philanthropists (lovers of men –not mere men of wealth) show that such a conception of work is possible, and that it is closely associated with magnanimous living. Men work hard and long at tedious toil for the joy they get in using the income from the work, not to acquire more money, but to make life more meaningful. When one can, by means of work, become independent so far as the necessities of life are concerned, and can devote his deeper passions and interests toward some ends wholly unselfish and outside of his own realm of private gain, work becomes a kind of tool. It is the means of accomplishing high purposes. Just as the artist expresses his own personality in his actual work, so some men work that they may express their personalities in some form of service and helpfulness. In fact, this second kind of activity is their real work, because it expresses the deepest longings of their nature. Lord Shaftesbury and William E. Gladstone were such men. That which others call his work is a mere means to an end, and, while he does it well and honestly, it is not the real medium through which he hopes ultimately to make his enduring contribution.

(3) *Work may be interpreted as a means of sustaining and supporting others who are dependent and who are the objects of one's love.* In such cases, the nature of the work reveals in large measure what one really thinks of his loved ones.

He works for them, his work reflects his own interest in them. Such a conception of work is quite common among what we call the "labor class" where men day by day give honest labor because they thus show their loyalty and love for their families. That such a conception of work is a factor in morality is seen by the number of advertisements which ask for men who have families. Usually too shallow an interpretation is put upon this attitude. Men are not stable merely because they have families. Every city has hundreds of cases where married men are quite as indolent as bachelors. But if a man conceives of his work as that which makes his family life possible and happy, the result is a loyalty that is as constant as human nature can be.

(4) *A fourth conception of work is that of the trusted servant who devotes himself to his work because he feels that his services are needed.* This is quite a common conception of work among the American negroes. He easily persuades himself that his master needs his services. Therefore, if he slacks, his master suffers. This is perhaps an egotistical conception, but it affects one's moral life by making him feel his own importance. Through his work, he supplies directly the wants of his master, and therefore he must not fail.

(5) *We need hardly name those conceptions of work which dwell upon wholly different aspects from those we have been considering. Briefly, some consider work to be a curse.* They believe that those for whom they work are the lords, oppressing them. Life they say was made for pleasure, not for pain; and work is always painful. Usually this type of person does not differentiate between mental and physical work, for he supposes that there is no work but physical work. Therefore, such a man may set himself against all who do not perform physical labor. He may even feel that his own wife does no real work because she does not keep regular hours and submit herself to the daily directions of others who pay her wages. Others consider work to be drudgery. It is a necessary evil, something which cannot be avoided. They believe that one should not work too conscientiously. Work is, according to this conception, a means of getting something out of life—a means of extracting a living from one's environment. This view is directly opposed to that which looks upon work as means of contributing something to the enrichment of the experiences of the race. It is evident that the individual attitudes toward work are germane to our thesis because they determine so largely one's individual and social responses. Certainly there is a close relation between a lofty conception of work and a high moral character.

HOW TO INTERPRET THE SIGNIFICANCE OF WORK. Having discussed some of the possible attitudes toward work, we now turn to the problem of interpreting such attitudes to children. Our problem is one almost exclusively with children, because after one has toiled for a number of years at a given task, he seldom changes his attitude towards it unless some unusual experience upsets his whole mental and moral interests and habits. Sometimes conversion, or the death of a loved one, or losing one's position, or any experience which demands a sudden facing of facts may change an adult's attitude towards work. On the whole, however, our problem is one which deals primarily with the child's attitude toward work before he sets himself permanently to a given task.

(1) School work may be interpreted from the standpoint of its cultural value, as well as from the monetary advantage it gives the person with schooling. By cultural value we mean the influence schooling may have upon the child by making him understand life's values, by helping him to understand

a meaningful world, by helping him to develop his own potentialities. The effects of such an interpretation of work would be: (a) *The child, while looking upon the school work as a source of helpfulness, nevertheless would respond to it as he would to remunerative work, or to work which is done for the love of the aesthetic.* The child will, if he has a high conception of school work, industriously devote himself to it. Consequently he may develop such moral qualities as carefulness, punctuality, and cheerfulness. Not only so, but he may form certain habits of study and certain mental associations which seem to have a kind of expulsive power for desires and ambitions less worthy. School work thus may become typical of all work, and the child may respond to it eagerly as he prepares all the while for what he hopes is a more useful way of expressing his own true self in later years. (b) *The child may appreciate the value of contributing something to the total life experiences of the race.* His books may suggest to him how helpful have been the services of those who, through hard work, prepared them for his use. He may regard books as store-houses of the race's experiences which he may profitably study. Consequently he lives in a world richer and more meaningful than the world of those who prepared the books and who furnished the data out of which the books were written. (c) *The child may be led to understand that the school itself is an institution to teach him the meaning and value of work and to give the rudimentary practice requisite to establish the habits and attitudes which are to form for him permanent work-attitudes, ideals, responses and practices.* When such is the case, the school itself has profited directly because such an attitude on the part of the majority of the pupils in a given school will change it from a place of duty to a place of high privilege where the children regard their studies seriously and earnestly because they are, to them, as real as any experiences which they ever hope to have. It is the attempt to secure this attitude toward the school that lies beneath many modern attempts to change the spirit of the school by changing first the curriculum and the methods of instruction. Somehow teachers have felt that the children must not think of the school as an intervention between them and real life, as an institution which must be endured until they grow beyond the authority of law and parents. In order to change this conception which is held by many pupils, the teachers have attempted first to work changes in the school, hoping eventually to work change in the individual. Whether this is possible, we do not know. But this much is certain, that unless the child himself sees that the school is a reality, that its work is not temporary, but eternal, that its values are as lasting as the values of the mart and office, he will not stay in school. Unless he sees that when he does well in school he is doing well in real life, that the school is a part of real life, he will not respond whole-heartedly to it. If the child remains for ten or twelve years in school, doing just what he must, having a bad spirit toward those who are in charge, doing his work in a dull manner, not understanding the meaning of the institution as it tries not only to give him information, but to mold and shape him for life, he has formed habits which may well be counted dangerous. It is not accidental that many practical business men have been wary of the college trained man. As compared with the boy who entered work at fourteen, the college boy has often seemed lazy and listless. His college experience taught him not to work, but to shirk. This is the most serious charge which can be brought against the school; for if the school contributes to the forming of bad work habits, it has done a lasting injury to the child and to society. We need studies to show just where we

stand in this whole matter. At present we depend only upon common observations, and these observations are unreliable. But this much is certain; in every school there are loafers, those who not only do little themselves but lower the standards of all. It is possible that studies would show that schools often allow the lazy dullard to corrupt the eager, energetic pupils. Some investigation ought to be made to give the facts on this point, and then remedies ought to be sought. There is some reason to doubt that "all the children of all the people" ought to be put in the same school system. Perhaps we are working at a great loss because we do not grade the students early in the system. One of the bases on which we might divide pupils is their attitude toward work.

(d) *The school may teach the child how to work advantageously and economically.* Each child should be taught the rudiments of studying and the principles of self-correction. The idea should be not to make out of each pupil a future scholar, but simply to interpret study as a type of work; and, therefore the student should learn that, just as when he was in the school he learned to do his school work economically and accurately, so in the future, at whatever work he may find himself engaged, he should apply the same principles of economy and efficiency. He need not carry into his future life the specific knowledge which we might call the "study knowledge", but the universal principle which he could learn should be "whenever I have a piece of work to do, I must attack it in the most economical and efficient way; and as I continue the work, I must practice a rigid self-correction in order that I may as early as possible master the details of the work so that I may constantly enlarge its scope and eventually make this particular piece of work better serve humanity." Such a conception of work, even if gained by a few, would be revolutionary in its consequences. The fact that many students do not learn to study efficiently is indicative of a more serious shortcoming. It often signifies that they have not learned to do any kind of work well. Although the school is already over-burdened, it must somehow teach its boys and girls how to work. Not to do so is to fail in its mission. Even trade schools must give more than information. They must lead the pupils to form definite "work-habits."

(e) *One more principle which is worthy of consideration is the thought that almost every form of work offers advantages for the utmost of skill and efficiency.* No man is bigger than his job. He may be "bigger" than his job in a particular locality, but the real work in which he is engaged calls forth from him all his powers. The professions are always offering new heights to professional men. Even menial labor offers possibilities to the men who perform it. There is in work an inexhaustible field for improvement and investigation. It can always be done better, more efficiently, and made to serve the commonwealth better. If children could be led to adopt such a theory as this, all work would be considered honorable and class distinction might in time be blotted out. Whoever does his work well, should be in the respected class, regardless of what his work may be. Whoever does not do his work well should be in the lower class, regardless of the nature of his work. Service rendered according to one's ability should be the criterion by which we judge a man's value to society.

MORAL SIGNIFICANCE OF RIGHT ATTITUDE TOWARD WORK. (1) *Since work consumes so much of one's time and nervous energy it is impossible for it not to have profound influence upon his character.* We have already shown how work is a means of interpreting life as a whole and how the quality of work reveals much about the worker's character. We have now to point out that the "oc-

cupied" mind is most easily controlled. The mind that is engaged, directed toward great ends, is the mind which gives us the steady type of workman and therefore of citizen. A right attitude is opposed to the wavering, unstable, unreliable type. Steadiness, we believe, is a high moral attainment. (2) *A high conception of work helps to direct youth to worthy vocations.* Steadiness may fall short. One may be steady in work which is injurious to society and therefore wrong. For example, one may be steady and faithful while he sells worthless mining stock to poor working people. In this case his industrious character would make him all the more vicious. But if, as we have indicated, a boy considers work to be a means of serving humanity, then he will not engage himself in work which is evil. Therefore, we may say that one's conception of work has moral value in that it tends to divert him from enterprises which are considered harmful. If his work does not express his own best self, he will seek work which does. In this case, the harmful and questionable forms of work would not be over-crowded as at present. The writer recently heard two bootleggers lamenting that their profession was so over-crowded that "a man can't make a decent living at it any more." This is most suggestive. (3) *One's attitude toward work also determines his moral life in general to the extent that he can not do constantly a high type of work unless he lives a quiet, temperate life.* If a man has a high estimate of work, he subdues his bodily appetites accordingly. The most dissolute young men have been known to become temperate and sober in all their living in order that they might win physical prowess in boxing or wrestling. Most athletes who take pride in their work willingly impose upon themselves strict discipline. The man who looks upon work as a means of paying the expenses of having a good time will always live as carelessly as he thinks his employer and his work will permit. Hence, there is a direct relationship between one's attitude and his habits of temperance and sobriety. The consistently high moral life of such professional men as clergymen, teachers, and physicians is not accidental. In large part it is the direct result of the attitude they have toward their work. They make little or no distinction between their personal reputation and that of their professional reputation. They live in their work. (4) *To be passionately engaged in serviceable work tends to become an antidote to the inordinate desires for pleasure and amusement, and also does away with all the problems of the "unoccupied" mind.* Sociology has gathered together much data which show that there is a direct relationship between idleness and immorality of all kinds. Seemingly this is a law of human nature: that one is apt to follow the lower desires, if his higher desires do not occupy his consciousness and demand his energy. Therefore, work which consumes both one's interest and one's strength is a stabilizing force. It keeps him from attempting to feed his bodily desires which are commonly satisfied by inordinate eating, by alcoholic drinks, opiates, licentiousness, etc. Furthermore, our penal systems have found that one of the best moral curatives is hard, wholesome work; whereas one of the worst moral curses is idleness. When one has taught the child the right attitudes toward work, he has done much to insure moral stability which will be enduring. The reason that so many youth go wrong is that they have no wholesome attitude toward work which demands of them their whole interest and their whole strength. When a young man is "having his fling," we say he will settle down as soon as he gets a good job. The reason is obvious. So our whole system of education breaks down if it allows many children to spend a period of three or four years during which time there is much idleness and

if what is done is done in a slovenly manner. While we do not look upon proper work attitude as being "cure-alls," we do believe that much could be done in both individual and social reform if parents, teachers and employers co-operated in some definite scheme of education. If a given generation of young people could be taught to work, many of the so-called moral problems which now perplex us, especially with the adolescent, would disappear. If it be claimed that farm life overthrows this argument, we would reply that at present in few cases is work on the farm understood in the higher aspects which we have suggested. This is one of the reasons why so many youths leave the farm. They want to escape work and do not throw themselves unreservedly into it. While it is true that the farm sends a high type of man to the city's industrial institutions, it is also true that the farm sends a great many into the city's "gangs" and that many of the so-called "criminal" class have gone from the farm into the city's underworld. Furthermore, many of the farmers who remain on the farms have no lofty conception of work. They live a life of menial drudgery when they might live abundantly.

Here it will be well to point out certain possible applications of the psychological principles underlying the work-attitudes to the problem of reform, especially in our penal institutions. (1) Wholesome work, from which prisoners receive a just compensation, will tend to create wholesome attitudes toward their teachers and their environment in general. (2) Opportunity to work at tasks at which they have special skill and aptitude will be beneficial, by insuring a higher type of interest, and therefore more energy will be spent in pursuing such work. (3) If work is both pleasurable and remunerative, the problem of the unoccupied mind will not be so difficult. Bodies and minds, tired from a day's work, which have willingly poured their energies into constructive labor will not spend hours on unwholesome and debilitating thoughts and evil practices after the day's work is done. (4) Much of the work of the prisoner ought to be study; but this study should be conceived as real work in order that he may acquire the proper work-attitudes and learn how to work economically and efficiently. Of course, so long as society simply desires to punish the offender and not to restore him to a place of service in society, such a plan will be thought impracticable.

TEACHING THE CHILD WORK-ATTITUDES. Our problem now is to suggest how we may teach proper work-attitudes to children. This involves: (1) an interpretation of work so that the child respects it; (2) actual participation in work so that there may be training; (3) the generalization of the work-attitudes the child has learned from his meagre work-experience, applying them to all work; (4) the time element involved; (5) the question of vocations, opportunities for advancement, opportunities for service, and remuneration. We shall deal with these aspects of the question in the order named.

(1) Work must be interpreted to the child. One of the best ways, of course, to do this is by imitation. The child merely through imitation will learn that work is difficult and that it is tiresome. But he will also learn from the parent that work is honorable and respect for work will become a matter of course. Through imitation and participation the child gets certain ideas of work which become of permanent value. Through imitation he learns that some things can be done without training, but that to do many things requires training. One cannot always do what he sees another do without similar thought processes; and the child discovers that he cannot do work exactly like that of the adult until he has first learned the mental processes.

Hence we have the common expression that certain kinds of work require "brains." This means that more than imitation is necessary. One can imitate the motions of the violinist quite well after the first observation, but he cannot reproduce the music until he has spent days and weeks and months in hard work. It is well to let the child have these experiences. It is well also to let him try his hand at many tasks in order that he may discover the difference between the various types of work. Such a procedure lays the foundation for a rational evaluation of work later on when the child is to decide what particular type of work he is to perform for his life work. But in all cases, work must be interpreted in such a way that it appears as an opportunity to serve the higher human interests. For example, in the home there are many menial tasks which furnish practical illustrative material. The child can be taught that dishwashing is an important part in the process of health. Whether one becomes a dish-washer for life, or whether one only washes the dishes for the family, as most mothers must do, the task itself is noble work enough. There is nothing mean and vulgar about dish-washing, therefore one who is washing dishes is contributing in this way toward the health and happiness of humanity. Sweeping and mopping present the same problem. They are not merely difficult things, they are quite necessary. Theirs is also a useful function because they contribute to the health of the physical body and also tend to strengthen the attitude of self-respect which is so essential if men are to strive for a perpetually progressing society. So it is with washing and ironing and all the work of the house. And here also the foundations can be laid so that the child in later life will not despise those who do these tasks for a living. The scrub-woman and the laundry-man are both servants of society and if their work is done well they deserve the respect of their fellow men. The moral value of such an attitude is most wholesome, and it is well to cause the child actually to participate in all such work while he is in the home. The parent should insist, also, that the work be done thoroughly and carefully. The child will then discover that it requires something more than strength properly to scrub a room, or to wash dishes so that they are thoroughly sterilized. In homes where the mother does not do her own work, there is no reason why the child should not then help the servants. There is no substitute for participation in work, and psychology knows no laws of learning for the well-to-do and another set for the servant class. Of course, we are not arguing that every child should learn to do menial work. We are only arguing that one may learn right work-attitudes from doing menial work or work of any other kind. There can be no greater moral principle than the nobility of good workmanship, no matter what the particular work may be. The psychological principles involved in securing such a principle in the life of the child are: (1) Let only proper interpretations of work be made to the child while he is young. (2) Let no distinctions be made which lead to classifying work as "common" and "respectable." (3) Emphasize that the character of the work reveals the personality of the workman. (4) Identify good workmanship with service, and show that only in this way can worthy contributions to society be made.

(2) *Training in Work.* In the foregoing paragraph we have argued for interpreting work so that it is respected by the child. Our task now is to outline a plan for putting the child to work. Nothing but general suggestions can be given in this study, the detailed principles must of necessity be worked out in each family group. (a) We should make a distinction between work and chores for our purpose. While the value of chores is great, especially for young-

er children, except on the farm and other places where the chores demand long and continued work, they may be performed so perfunctorily and so hastily that little training experience is acquired. We should emphasize chores and errands as being indispensable for the smallest of children; but here our problem requires that considerable continuous time be spent upon a given task. Hence we shall speak of work to distinguish more difficult tasks from those which require but a few minutes. (b) If the child does not have continuous work at home by the time he is ten years of age he ought to be put where there is work which he can do. In case of girls, it is possible, perhaps, to arrange the house work, washing, ironing, baking, etc., so that they will have continuous tasks lasting over a period of several hours. In the case of the city boy, work must usually be sought outside the home. Here one may choose between some trade, or the farm. If the boy cannot earn money the parent would be justified in paying a fee to the employer provided the boy is in a good environment. This is the extension of the old apprentice system to meet the changing situations in our social life. Of course, the child should not be kept out of school. This kind of training should be performed in the summer, or on Saturdays during the school session. The points to be emphasized in this type of training are: (a) *The arduousness of work*—it makes one tired. But rest soon restores the strength, so that being tired is not to be feared. The child who learns early not to be afraid of getting tired has learned a valuable lesson. (b) *Work presents problems which must be solved by sheer ingenuity*. Almost all types of work occasionally present difficulties which must be met immediately. The boy on the farm is called on to mend the harness when it breaks—something he has never done before—or the girl must repair her electric iron—a new task for her. Hence the child sees that the successful workman is the one who uses brain as well as brawn. (c) *Need for a certain degree of fortitude*. One must work when he does not feel well, when he suffers pain, or when his feelings are hurt. He thus learns that work involves responsibility. One cannot be flighty and also be efficient. Moreover, work itself cures many ills by occupying the mind until time—the most effective curative for temporary ills—has had opportunity to do its work. In many situations, work is a blessing in disguise. It is better for the child to be away from home at work, than to remain at home in idleness. (d) Work is the only creative agency known to men. For everything we have, whether comfort or necessity, work has been expended. Therefore, to work is to contribute; not to work is to be a parasite. The child will never learn this principle quite as well as if he is put at tedious work where, perhaps, others are inclined to be shirkers and loafers. (e) The work should be done thoroughly. Mistakes and errors ought to be corrected. Efficiency ought to be secured. Skill ought to be one of the goals of training in work. Accuracy, speed, carefulness, and other qualities ought to be expected of the child as a part of his training. One criticism of much of the manual work done in the schools is that the supervisor does much of the work and gives the student the credit. This is demoralizing and should not be permitted. For example, a boy brought home from school a fudge-apron which bore his name. He confessed, when questioned that the teacher really made it but told him to put his name on it and “play like” he did it all by himself. This extreme case shows the problem of being “too easy” on children. One can be firm without being harsh, and the manual training teachers need this quality above all others. Of course, the same principles obtain in the general work of the school, with which we have already dealt. (f) Work, rightly

understood and enthusiastically done, is often quite as delightful as games and is quite as healthful under proper conditions. It is the worst of all principles to pit work and play against each other as if one were punishment and the other reward. Parents almost universally make "play" the prize at the end of a little unpleasant work. While this practice seems harmless enough, there is always the suggestion that work is something to be dreaded, something to be endured and that "play" is the experience which is to be anticipated and cherished. We believe that play has fundamental bearings upon the problem of good living, but we do not believe that games are either more important or more enjoyable than work when the right work-attitudes are established. We believe that the two terms ought not to be looked upon as being opposites but rather as complements.

(3) How can work-attitudes be transferred from one type of work to another? Of course there is little to be transferred from one piece of work to another, except work-attitudes, unless the two pieces of work require identical movements and habits. Since the work-attitudes are mental processes, and since they do not have to do primarily with muscular activity, one may think of them as becoming a part of his way of attacking all problems. Such work-attitudes as seriousness, industriousness, high regard for work, desire to do good work, efficiency, etc., are attitudes with which one may attack any kind of work. Once these attitudes are acquired, one may change from one type of work to another wholly different and, without difficulty and almost unconsciously, be able to attack the new work with the same mental attitudes. The transfer of work-attitudes may be taken as a matter of course if they are well established. Otherwise, there would be little use trying to teach the child work-attitudes in the home or in the school.

(4) How much time should be spent in work? We believe four things must be taken into consideration: (a) the age of the child; (b) the nature of the work; (c) the progress the child has made in school work; (d) the remuneration.

(a) If we suppose that by the time a child is ten years of age he is old enough to work faithfully at a given task for a considerable length of time, then we shall have some point at which to start our discussion of the time element involved. The average child of normal strength at the age of ten might be able to work four hours each day at some physical task within his capacity. Such out-door work as hoeing, pulling weeds, berry-picking, general garden work, etc., is within his capacity and he ought to be expected to work faithfully at this work for two hours in the morning and two more hours in the afternoon. If the work is rather more mental than physical and requires a high degree of concentration, the time of each day's work ought to be cut down somewhat, either by reducing the total time or by giving frequent rest periods, or by both. Children at this age can profitably work two or three hours a day at a machine, such as a printing press, or other light work if the conditions of ventilation and light are good. Studies of child-labor show clearly that the child may have his health impaired if conditions are not good, and if his working hours are too long. However, for centuries children of ten years of age have done simple, light work a few hours each day with seemingly no injurious results. As the child grows older, it would be better to make his work a little more difficult and complicated than to lengthen his total working hours. By the time a child is sixteen, however, he can work six or eight hours daily without injury if both home and working conditions are good. Here it might be said that the chief curses of child-labor are not due to the fact that children

work, but the abuses which are made of the fact that children can work. We have called attention above to the fact that children should work in summer time and for the child between ten and twelve years of age to work a few hours each day for two or three months will not only build up a sturdy set of muscles, if it be physical work, but also give him valuable training in forming work-attitudes. One cannot be more specific on this point for the simple reason that children during these years vary so much in size and strength, and working conditions and different types of work vary so widely that no definite schedule of the exact time a child should work each day according to age could be worked out except through long and thorough investigation. It is safe to say that there is no danger whatever that ninety percent of the children will work too hard. The danger lies rather in the leniency of the parent during those years when the child ought to be introduced to work experiences which are definite and real.

(b) What kind of work should the child engage in? We have already partially answered this question. The simplest answer is that he ought to be put to that work which is both convenient and advantageous. Here no rule can be set down. It is purely a matter for the individual family to solve. There are some reasons for changing the child's environment if possible for his work-experiences. If it can be arranged, it is well for the city child to spend some weeks in the country each year. Likewise, it would be of great value if the country child could have a few weeks' work-experience in the city. The chief problem is that the child shall have the opportunity to work at something which does not in any way impair his health. In the city, boys can work at such tasks as clerking in stores; carrying papers; information service, delivery service; printing press work; light janitor work; mowing lawns, washing windows; tending furnaces, etc. Much of this work can be done by girls, who also can do house work, take care of children, answer telephone calls and door-bells, etc.

(c) What should be the relation between "work" and school-work? The point here is that the work we plan for the child ought never to be done at the expense of the child's schooling. Of course, we would not argue that school-education is the only type, for of course, in the history of the race, schools are very recent institutions. But as we look forward to the next half-century in our own social order, we see clearly that the child will be at a great disadvantage who has not had several years of school training. If we could conceive of schools as having to do with something besides books and classes, there might be some plan worked out by the co-operation of parents and teachers whereby there could be a correlated scheme of "work" and school-work.

(d) What should be the child's attitude toward remuneration? From the standpoint of psychology, it seems clear that the child ought, in most cases, to receive pay for his work for the following reasons: (a) his interest will be heightened, (b) the work will seem more real than if it is done gratis, (c) habits of thrift and money values can be learned as a part of the work-attitudes. Other reasons might be given. Even if the child works for his parents, he ought to receive pay. But he had better not be paid for all the "chores" and favors which he is asked to do. The child must learn to be helpful and courteous without thought of pay. He ought to be delegated to run errands for older people or for those who have no children and it is not necessary that he receive pay for such services. He must learn to be accommodating. When he does hard work, however, he ought to receive pay. He can then

measure costs in terms of labor. The candy, or the book, or the dress, or the cap, or the theatre, or the air-gun will be worth to him so many hours of labor. Are they worth it? That is for him to decide. Obviously, the sooner the child learns to estimate costs in terms of labor, the sooner he can put thrift and economy on a rational basis. The moral value of this is especially significant for all children who leave home to go to school and who spend money they have never earned. (d) Wages tend to make the child believe that his work is valuable and appreciated, therefore wages are to him a kind of praise. And no greater praise can come than an occasional raise in wages. For this reason wages for children should begin very low so that there may be an occasional raise to show the parent's approval. In some degree wages ought to be related to quality of work. The child ought to see that good work is of more service and, therefore, of more value than poor work. In no case should he be paid merely "by time." He is not paid for the time he puts in, but for the work done, for the service rendered. If we speak of so many "hours" we refer to the service rendered during that time. The mere passing of time has no monetary value, and the world is full of adults who did not learn this lesson when they were children. The most feasible plan of paying for work is to decide that certain tasks, perhaps regular ones, shall be paid for. Raise in pay can come as a result of efficiency and willingness. All other tasks must be done because of the membership of the child in a communal group where each member must contribute to as well as profit by the family life as a whole.

(5) The question of vocations, advancement, need for service, opportunities for monetary gain are all important questions which the child ought to face in his early years. Vocations ought to be explained to the child as offering opportunities to serve according to his own specific abilities. Four principles ought to be explained to the child about vocations: (a) each vocation offers opportunity for service or for graft. Men are not good because of the profession, but professions are good because of the men who enter them. Character is a prime requisite for any great life of professional service. (b) Each vocation offers a man the opportunity to expend all his powers and energies. No man is too big for any profession. Every man who earnestly spends his life in some calling can find in it many problems to tax his mental capacities and to wear him out physically. (c) Each profession probably requires not one but several specific abilities. Every man who has a good voice will not make a good lawyer or clergyman, because both of these professions require clear judgment, tact, ability to get along with others, ability to disagree with those with whom they work without causing friction, etc. The good voice is a great asset to either a clergyman or lawyer, but one of the least. Some of the greatest men in both of these professions have the poorest voices. The man with a good voice who has no brains, no ability to think, had better be a show-barker where his voice will be his chief asset. It is foolish, then, for a youth to choose a profession merely because he feels that a single trait of his would be of value in the profession which attracts him. (d) The child ought to be taught that each profession requires strenuous work and sacrifice. It seems nice to think of a banker putting in only six hours each day. But the banker himself puts in sleepless nights over the financial conditions of his bank and of his customers, even as the good physician suffers along with his patients and as the lawyer pleads his cases long into the small hours of the night. Parents and teachers ought to help the youth prepare for his choice of a vocation by stressing these points, and especially insisting that he ought to know

himself as thoroughly as possible so that he can predict in what work he could make the greatest contribution and perform the greatest service of which he is capable.

The child needs help in distinguishing between remuneration and service. Youth is a great admirer of physical success. He frequently dreams of being wealthy. Those occupations which seem to make men wealthy will have great appeal to him. Here the parent can be of great service if he will show the youth professional salary averages. All men who speculate in oil are not millionaires. The per cent is really very low. And so it is with engineering and most of the professions. Moreover, remuneration is not merely due to professional genius or worth. Among some of the elements which go to make a man successful are (I) opportunity for advancement, that is, opportunity for his work to be known and appreciated; (II) fortuitous occurrences which nobody could have foreseen; (III) industriousness and faithfulness which have been the ground for loyalty and confidence on the part of the others; (IV) ability to understand the genius of the work in which a man is engaged and its relation to society in general. We usually call this last characteristic "insight" or "foresight." Now, it is evident that many men have all these characteristics except the second one, and yet are not successful financially. Therefore, when the child figures on the remuneration he is to get in the future, he will do well to study averages rather than exceptions. A further word ought to be said here about the desire to make money. In itself it is legitimate. If a man's organizing ability makes him capable of rendering a great service to his fellow men, and if as a result he accumulates a vast fortune, there is no inherent sin in doing so. The real character of the man will be shown not in the fact that he amassed his money, but in how he spends and uses it. Hence it is important that, long before the man becomes rich, his ideals of altruism, helpfulness, desire for public welfare, etc., be clearly formulated and that he have convictions in such matters.

Finally, it ought to be said that work is both warp and woof of one's emotional and intellectual life. One's work has profound influence in what he likes, what he desires to possess, how he spends his leisure time, what his ambitions in life are. If a man's work is simple, his wants are few. But if his work is of a complex nature, then his whole life is affected. So it is with one's thoughts. The common laborer's thoughts are quite different from those of the university professor. But if both are thinking about the things that make for peace, harmony and progress; and are giving themselves to such purposes,—each in his own way, and in his own sphere—then each may have profound respect for the other for each thereby serves the other. Work has received such an extended discussion here because it is important in moral behavior and because it is usually slighted. More space by far is given to "play" than to "work" in treatises of this nature, and it seemed wise, therefore, to turn matters around for once that both "work" and "play" might be seen in different proportions.

LITERATURE AS A SOURCE OF IDEALS

Chapter IX

For ages men have thought deeply and wisely, and their thoughts are contained in literature. Through translations we can now read the wisdom of other peoples as well as that of our own race and nation. One of the weak elements in modern education is that students are not taught to care for literature. To most of the students it is dry and uninteresting. While we would not argue that all literature is of equal interest, it is probable that students have developed prejudices against literature by hearing certain remarks by parents, teachers, or comrades. Many students make up their minds beforehand that literature is something to be endured and not to be enjoyed. Such an attitude is doubtless due to wrong practices which could be changed.

(1) *It may be that in the grades, for example, the teacher who attempts to interpret literature for the children is uninteresting in her own personality and that she does not love literature.* To her it may be something to be gone through because it is on the schedule of courses. She may not eagerly think over again with the author his thoughts; she may make no emotional response; she may be unaware of literature's beauty and worth. Just one such experience may turn the child against literature forever. We may chide him and tell him he is foolish, but his mind is made up and too often he never changes. (2) *The literature may not be suited to the age of the child.* Within reasonable limits, children, especially in the grades and high school, ought to have opportunity to read and study the literature they like. Only in this way can the teacher create an active interest in literature. When the teacher has secured the child's interest in one type of literature, she can then lead him from one form of literature to another until literature as a whole becomes a treasure-house of great thoughts beautifully expressed. (3) *Some teachers still use the study of literature as a means of punishment.* This, of course, is fatal. To learn Shakespeare because one is being punished is not to learn Shakespeare, but only to commit to memory certain words which he used. The real Shakespeare, the beauty of thoughts and expression is lost through unwholesome association. Even in assigning work in literature, teachers often make it appear as if it were a task to be dreaded rather than an opportunity to know something worth while. Some teachers have the knack of making literature so interesting that the pupils fairly long to have the literature hour come. Only such teachers ought to be entrusted with the teaching of literature and, at whatever cost, each school should be provided with them.

VALUE OF BIOGRAPHY. Biography is the record of human achievement. It records how an individual has struggled for supremacy over his own weaknesses and over the opposition of his environment. Therefore, biography, as perhaps no other literature, appeals to youth. It bristles with action, with crises, with decisions, with battles. Because of the interest these elements in biography arouse in the mind of youth, the biography of Jesse James may be just as attractive and influential as that of Theodore Roosevelt. That teachers and parents are so stupidly careless in this matter is almost unthinkable.

For young children, only those biographies which present clean idealism and altruistic as well as individualistic attitudes ought to be read. The value of such virtues as obedience, patience, endurance, honesty, etc., should be emphasized. As the children grow older and are trained to exercise critical

judgment, they may read biographies of men who have glaring weaknesses and who may be studied in order to show the results of these weaknesses.

Biographies should be chosen for their influence as well as for their interest. In the past, doubtless, we have paid too much attention to generals and not enough to statesmen and reformers. Because of this, even many of our educated persons believe that such men as Washington, Lee, and Grant were great because they fought. But to fight with arms is not the only way to fight. The statesman fights with truth. At any rate, it seems quite certain that if we are to build up attitudes of peace and harmony in the minds of the youth, we must not let Generals have such a prominent place in our lists of heroes. One of the chief influences of biography is that it either furnishes the reader with his hero—direct and ready made—, or it furnishes him the data out of which he creates his own hero. The warrior-hero may have a place in biographical literature, but there is no reason why he should crowd out the missionary, the poet, the scholar, the statesman, the inventor, or the teacher. The life of Charles W. Elliot or of William James or of David Starr Jordan would be worth much more to American youth than the life of General Pershing. Biographical literature is rich in many fields of human endeavor. All great men live great lives. They do not confine their talents and energies to a narrow vocational interest. It does not matter very much how our heroes earned their livelihood as long as they were truly great men. The important question is "Is he worthy of imitation?" "Could he be followed with profit?" It ought to be said, however, that the war-like tendencies in boys are so strong that if they read biographical literature which emphasizes the battlefield, the fighting interest will unquestionably secure greater responses than other characteristics which the general-hero might have. The general, for example, may have been kind to his own men; but to the boy, the chief thing may be that he was "rough" with the enemy. Of course those who believe in wars do right if they keep the general-hero in the text-book and class-room.

The value of biography in moral education may be summarized as follows: (1) It presents heroes or hero-characteristics which the reader tends to imitate. (2) Its lively human interest gives much satisfaction to the reader and thereby becomes influential in shaping his thoughts. (3) The necessity for persistence and patience is emphasized. (4) The value of friendships and the injury of enmities is set forth. (5) The value of good habits and clean living in a personal struggle for success are recognized.

POETRY. Poetry is of interest to the moral educator because of its lofty thought and its beauty of expression. Good poetry can be understood if studied, and there is no reason why poetic literature should not have a large place in the education of youth. The poet deals with the moral and spiritual significance of life's experiences. Some poems deal with the tender relationships of life, with love and kindness, with suffering and want—with those things which appeal to the affections. Other poetry exalts the common experiences of life by giving them spiritual significance. Any normal child will appreciate poetry and profit by it if it is carefully selected with respect to (a) his mental capacity, (b) a content which is naturally interesting, (c) the style, rhythm, etc. For American children, the American poets naturally have the greatest charm and since many of their poems are of lofty sentiment and stately form, there is no reason for requiring the children to learn and study first poems written in a foreign country where conditions are different and which are difficult for the child to understand. It is this practice that frequently makes American

children hate poetry. Most children do not hate the simple poems written about American home and country life. Those countries which have developed folk-songs have done so by magnifying native beauty. The child loves to hear his native country described in poetic language. When the child has begun to read poetry in such a way that his attitude toward it is wholesome, he is then in a position to be led on into the depths and heights of poetic thought and beauty.

The value of poetry as an aid to memorization can scarcely be exaggerated. What we wish the child to remember we should put into the poems of his early years. This is the method of handing down customs, traditions, and religion in lands where books are not generally used. There is grave doubt if the real traditional and religious conceptions can be transmitted in any other way. At least there are many indications that books are not a successful medium, for though the books may contain the social and religious conceptions of the race, the books themselves are left unread. The early Christians¹ put their beliefs into songs and Christianity is largely the product of these songs. Especially since the Reformation have songs become one of the chief means not only of permanently gripping the affections of the child, but of preserving for him the fundamental beliefs. The truly great hymns of Christianity are religious poems which are sufficiently catholic in spirit to embrace all people. Like the Lord's prayer and the Shepherd's Psalm, they breathe the deepest longings of the human soul. Children might well learn them in their earliest infancy before the cheaper sort of poems attracts their attention and becomes a substitute for what is inspiring and ennobling. The songs and poems, learned around the family hearth are abiding benedictions to hundreds who have faced the harsher things of life; and to sing them over again in later years is to bathe the soul in refreshing memories.

THE PLACE OF FICTION IN CHARACTER BUILDING, furnishes food for imaginative thought. If the fiction be good, the result is good. If the fiction appeals to the baser desires, like all other influences of this nature, it is to be condemned. There are three advantages of studying fiction which may be pointed out. (1) *Fiction furnishes abundant data for character study.* If a child reads two or three of Dickens' novels carefully, he soon sees the characters all about him. He may even go so far as to call a certain man in the community Uriah Heep or Micawber. Through the study of such books the youth receives practical training in "sizing-up" human beings. That he needs this is evident, especially since in our modern society he goes away from the parental home to establish a home for himself when he is still quite inexperienced. (2) *Fiction acquaints the child with the great moral ranges of which the human being is capable.* From the heights of innocence and purity to the depths of sin and degradation men and women are traced step by step. Fiction lets youth see what the wages of sin and of righteousness are. And the youth, as he reads, constantly makes choices—constantly takes sides—in such a manner that he has actually had practice in moral training and in making moral decisions. This is the beauty and the strength of fiction, that it makes one fight through mentally all the battles of the preferred characters. (3) *Fiction awakens in the mind of youth new conceptions of human conduct.* To the youth who reads a good novel, life takes on new meaning because of the new thoughts which have been aroused. He sees the meaning of life in a new light. In a few days he has observed a life

1. Mark 13:26 Acts 16:25. Also see Breed, David R., *The History of Hymns and Hymn Tunes.*

from the cradle to the grave. He has seen the baby become a child, the child become a man, the man become a business man and a parent. He has watched this man fight for his own rights and for the rights of his family. He has seen the sacrifice that family life and parenthood requires. He now understands many of the expressions of joy and sorrow he has seen on the faces of his own parents. Life is costly, that is why it is so precious. The youth who reads great novels begins early to understand the deeper meaning of life's common experiences.

Good fiction is easily interpreted, because it is illustrated in every-day experience. The child understands the situations readily and with little practice can look far ahead and predict the outcome of certain events. He does this not merely because he has learned the tricks of the novelist, but because he has begun to think about cause and effect in the moral world. Furthermore, fiction is a legitimate means of keeping the child at home and of occupying his time. For these reasons alone it would be well for each home to supply the children with plenty of well chosen books of fiction. The teachers in each community ought, from time to time, to prepare a list of books suitable for children of different ages and tastes.

THE SHORT STORY. This is the day of the short story and it is fitting that a reference to its use in moral education be made. First of all it should be said that the short story is as old as history and probably as old as the race. One of the finest types of short story is the parable, a story which is either true or might have been true. Jesus used the parable effectively in his teachings. His short stories of the Prodigal Son, The Good Samaritan, The Woman Taken in Adultery, The Rich Fool, The Two Foundations are still masterpieces. All children should know them for their sheer beauty and wealth of suggestion. The fable also is rich in homely philosophy and wisdom. The child should be encouraged to learn all the fables and parables he can get hold of. Reading them to him is not sufficient. He ought to have considerable drill in repeating them to others until he has mastered the essential words and phrases of the original. The modern short story which relates in full some detail of life is also to be recommended. The current magazines for small children and young people have abundant material of this kind which is fairly satisfactory. Perhaps it ought to be of higher grade. There is so much literature, and so little time to read it, that the child should not be allowed to read second grade material when first grade material is at hand. With but a little supervision, parents and teachers could improve the quality of the reading of the average boy and girl. Of course, the same is true of the adult's reading. Just now the fad is to read the latest work before the ink is scarcely dry. Little thought is being paid to quality because "recency" gives distinction to one's reading. Many of the modern short stories are good. But the classical short stories which have been handed down to us through the Bible and through the translations from the Greek and Latin ought to be put before the children, not because they are old, but because they are inherently good. Literature is not good because it is old; it is old because it is good. The story of Joseph is certainly as much worth while as is the average story in the modern children's magazine.

In connection with the short story it will be permissible to mention "sayings" or proverbs. There is no excuse for the children not being taught all of these that are available, for they can be learned very readily. Their value lies in the fact that they indicate certain values which the race has learned through experience. Certain virtues commend, certain vices are condemned.

The constant repetition of them before children unquestionably has some influence. Who for example has not been spurred on to steadfastness when he has heard an elder say "A rolling stone gathers no moss"?

LITERATURE WHICH APPEALS TO SPECIFIC INTERESTS. Each child has interests that are peculiarly his own. These interest reveal themselves frequently in what he likes to read. As long as his desires are not perverse they ought to be respected. The boy who likes to read along the lines of science and discovery ought to have access to such reading as he gets from popular scientific magazines; but especially he ought to have access to the works of natural scientists which deal with animal and plant life and with the control of the forces of nature. The native curiosity of youth makes this kind of literature very valuable. It ought, however, to be written by authorities.

On the other hand, allowing the boy or girl to read cheap and commonplace love stories or questionable adventure of various types is to be condemned. We have already referred to the use of fiction. We would emphasize that wholesome fiction is to be recommended for the largest possible use. But the cheap fascinating story which centers around sex or banditry is to be ruled out. Likewise books and stories which make the girl think she is a born actress or the boy that he is a born bravado are to be discouraged. Such so-called special interests are unwholesome.

TEACHING THE BIBLE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS. The literature in this field, especially in the form of articles, is abundant.² There seem to be two chief phases of the problem, with some subordinate considerations. First, there is the problem of the ignorance of the Bible. Examinations have shown that the present generation of students from the first grade to the senior year in the university are ignorant of the Bible. Educators generally agree that this is an undesirable condition, because the Bible is the religious literature of Christendom. It has influenced the life, literature, art and institutions of Christendom so pervasively that one is suspicious of the quality of education which permits people to graduate from college in total ignorance of the contents of the Bible. It reflects as much upon public education as upon the Christian churches that such a condition is true. Educators are supposed to embody in the curriculum those studies which are of the greatest service to the individual and to society. The fact that the Bible has been largely ignored in the making of curricula reflects somewhat upon the educators. They, themselves, admit it. Nor will it suffice to say that the law forbids the teaching of the Bible in the schools. The Bible, as a text book, might be objected to by some; but if the portions of the Bible which are especially rich in spiritual meaning and in literary quality were selected and embodied in collections of literature to be studied along with other masterpieces, one cannot easily be convinced that there would be much opposition.

The second aspect of the problem is that of the religious and moral influence of Bible study. Most of those who want the Bible taught in the public schools believe that it would have a direct bearing upon the moral and religious lives of the pupils. They call attention to the fact that there is now much lawlessness and crime and general moral laxity which could be done away with if only the Bible were in the public schools. They believe that the messages of the Bible have direct bearing upon the personal lives of all who read them.

2. The best articles the writer knows on this whole subject are to be found in bound volumes of *Religious Education*, published by the Religious Education Association, Chicago, Ill.

1. There seems to be no good reason for excluding the good literature of the Bible from the schools. The Bible is a literature, a collection of religious books. If certain of these books as a whole, or certain portions of them were selected for study in the public schools along with the literature of Greece, Rome, France and Germany, there would be no serious objection. (a) The Bible could be used as a reference book by teachers of literature. All libraries have the Bible as one of their reference books. Any teacher of literature who does not refer his students to the Bible cannot claim fear of the law. Only ignorance or indifference on the part of the teacher will explain such action. (b) The Bible might be taught by other agencies and credit given by the school. This plan is being tried in a great many places under varying circumstances.³ At Gary, Indiana, the various churches teach the Bible and the children are dismissed from their other studies to go to receive such instruction. This work is considered a normal part of the curriculum, not a mere appendage. In Colorado, Kansas, Indiana, Ohio, Wisconsin and many other states similar plans are now in operation.

2. The plea for the moral and spiritual influences of the Bible on the campus is difficult to discuss because it is impossible to know the facts. (a) Are the campuses where the Bible is in the curriculum more spiritually-minded than other campuses? (b) Or is the difference due to the fact that the colleges where the Bible is taught also happen to be small colleges where there is a closer bond between the teacher and pupil and between pupil and pupil than can exist in the larger institutions? (c) Does the presence of the Bible in the curriculum cause the apparent difference, or is the fact that the students are easily controlled toward spiritual things because of their small number? (d) Has the study of the Bible while in college changed these students, or were they already spiritually-minded, the product of a virile home life, before they came to college? (e) If the enrollment in such colleges could suddenly be increased ten fold, would there be a decided difference between the moral and religious lives of their students and the students attending schools where the Bible is omitted from the curriculum.

Such questions as these must be answered before we know intelligently how to attack the whole problem of religious instruction. Further, if the Bible is put into the schools, there must be provision made for it to be taught as it should be taught. Shall the schools employ trained religionists to teach the Bible as religion, or shall they expect the teacher of literature to teach it as literature?

In conclusion, the following points must be considered: 1. The essentials of the Bible could and should be taught at present by teachers of literature. If such teachers cannot interpret the spiritual contents of the Bible, they have no business teaching any kind of literature. 2. The Bible is not a book of magic. Its mere presence does not dispel wickedness. It is of no use except as its messages influence the ideals of students. Merely to have it in the curriculum would not suffice. In order for it to work changes in the character of the students it would need to become a part of their ideals and faith. 3. The home and the church should teach the Bible. Even if it is put into the school system, it still ought to be the great literature of the home and of the church school. 4. The messages of the Bible are much needed. In times of war, industrial strife, suspicion, crime, jealousy, and unrest, the messages of peace and good-

3. See *Religious Education*, The Religious Education Association, Chicago, Ill. vol. XI, p. 5.

will, of love and forgiveness, of sacrifice and loyalty, found in the Bible ought not to be neglected. The writer believes that any great teacher of literature will find some way to make these messages known to the students.

THE TEACHING OF LITERATURE. The supposition is that literature is taught, but frequently it would be more nearly the truth to say that there are classes in Literature. The teacher of literature ought to have four characteristics above all other teachers: (a) *She ought to have understanding.* She ought to be a careful student of psychology so that she can interpret personality and she ought also to be a careful student of the problems of human existence so that she will be familiar with the vicissitudes of life. (b) *The teacher of literature ought to know the field of literature.* She ought to be able to recite much of it from memory, to choose its jewels and present them to the students for them to admire, to enrich their own imagery by painting, with the words of the immortals, pictures which lift the soul out of the common planes to peaks of delight and ecstasy. Such teachers are rare, but exceedingly valuable. (c) *The teacher of literature ought to understand her pupils well enough that she can change their attitudes more or less at will by the class assignments.* For this reason a set curriculum is unfortunate. The writer remembers a most capable teacher of literature who was always making the students wish that they might really study what he termed the "great pieces" of literature. Instead, he had to "cover" the material "outlined" in the course. It may be unfortunate to set a class of fifty boys and girls to studying a single poem at the same time. There ought always to be a choice. Even the varying of the moods of the individuals would seem to demand this. Suppose that there are a dozen books which must be read. There is no necessity for demanding that they be read in a certain order. Of course, the mechanical teacher will resent such argument, for she will talk of "sequences" of "one book leading up to another," etc. Most of this is useless because the child does not recognize such sequences and relationships. After all, it is what the child sees and likes that is real to him. Many of the set curricula of the present must give place to a deeper regard for the individual desires of the students. (d) *The teacher of literature ought to be able to make the literature influence conduct immediately.* Whatever ideals of beauty and thrift and punctuality are contained in the literature must take hold of the pupil at once if they are to ever have efficacy. The teacher ought so to arrange the study of literature that the child is expected to respond to the messages which the literature has brought to him with an immediate change in conduct. Perhaps it ought to begin with the preparation of the lesson itself. What is there in the literature the class is studying? Suppose, for example, that all the Browning and Shakespeare Clubs took this attitude toward the literature they study. What a different world we might have! And suppose all who teach the Bible taught it in such a way that people felt it obligatory to try to put its principles into actual life. What might not have been done centuries ago. Teachers of literature have mighty weapons in their power when they deal with the great thoughts of great men. With these weapons they ought to fight the meanness, carelessness, and indifference of those whom they teach.

THE PLACE OF SEX IN MORAL EDUCATION

Chapter X

WHY THE PROBLEM OF SEX IS DIFFICULT. The whole question of sex presents one of the most difficult of all the problems of human education because: (1) The sex desires appear so young in childhood that they make necessary a long period of inhibition before marriage; (2) the very nature of sex is such that it must be dealt with only as one of the intimacies of the child's experience and not as one of his common-place experiences; (3) any infractions of the sex rules are so serious from the social view-point that little tolerance can be shown; (4) it is difficult to get a community opinion on the regulation of sex interests because the sex question does not admit of free discussion. Other reasons readily come to mind which need not be discussed here.

NEED FOR STRICT INHIBITION. Our whole social structure is built around the idea of a monogamous family. In order to preserve the sanctity of the home there must be the strictest adherence to the recognized sex standards. A man may lie many times, be forgiven and be re-instated as a member of the community. He may steal, make restitution and not be thought essentially dangerous. But he cannot commit adultery without thereby becoming the worst possible enemy of society. His act brings shame and disgrace not only to him, but to his family and his community. Such failure is great because respect for a law which society has learned after long experimentation to call sacred has been disregarded. In addition to failure to respect the laws of sex regularity, the very yielding to the desire for sexual intercourse breaks down the inhibitory bonds so quickly that, once started, it is with the greatest difficulty that original stability is regained. The desire for sexual gratification is so strong that to give vent to it but once may mean a long and bitter struggle before the desire is again brought under control. From the standpoint of psychology there can be no course but one of strictest continence. The problem of inhibition is intensified in modern society because marriage is postponed, usually several years beyond the age at which formerly marriage occurred. Whereas formerly the sexual desires had to be inhibited for six or seven years after puberty, at present they must be inhibited almost twice that long. It is probable, on account of certain psychological factors, that it would be easier to surrender to a permanent celibacy, as do certain religious orders, than to surrender to a temporary celibacy in which the time when legal sexual gratification is feverishly anticipated. One of the chief reasons for this is that if one abandons the thought of matrimony, he also abandons all the initiatory steps such as keeping company with the opposite sex and courtships. The person who only temporarily postpones marriage constantly subjects himself to association with the opposite sex and the inhibition of sex desires is thus made more difficult. W. S. Hall in his *Reproduction and Sexual Hygiene* argues that the presence of the opposite sex brings into play "secondary sexual qualities" and that both sexes experience a "subconscious sexual stimulation;" he gives the impression that such "subconscious stimulation" is not detrimental. The physiological reason for this, he suggests, is that the subconscious sexual stimulation produces an "internal secretion" of the sex organs which is absorbed into the blood, probably affecting the general tone and virility of the entire body.

On the whole, regardless of physiological changes which may unconsciously satisfy the sex desires, it seems clear that strict inhibition of the sex desire is

necessary, and that this involves a definite attempt to regulate the conditions under which one mingles with the opposite sex. If the sexes mingle freely together and come into intimate proximity, there can be little doubt that sexual excitement is augmented and that inhibition is made increasingly more difficult. Hall² says of dancing: "It hardly seems possible that a virile, husky man in his early twenties could be subjected for several hours to the conditions of the modern dance hall, where he is brought into very close physical contact with young women, dressed to expose their secondary sexual features, perfumed to excite in a man his hereditary sexual instincts; held so close to his partner in the round dance that he is conscious of every movement of her limbs, and all of these under the influence of artificial light and music—I say, it is hardly possible for a virile young man to be subjected to all these conditions without experiencing extreme sexual excitement." . . . "All specialists in this field, without a single exception, concur in the belief that the dance is a device of the devil so far as the young man is concerned."

Of course, the same argument is equally forceful when applied to all prolonged intimacies of the sexes. All such relationships as "spooning," "petting" and walking in such close contact that there is constant rubbing are to be condemned. Crowded seats in buggies, automobiles or in the theatre are always conducive to sexual excitement on the part of both sexes. Those who constantly indulge in such intimacies only make the fight for control more difficult and threaten to break down at any moment their own powers of inhibition and restraint.

Even the thoughts are to be guarded. Jesus understood human nature when he said, "I say unto you that every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." (Mt. 5:28, A. R. V.) Next to isolation there is probably no more effective safeguard for the man who wishes to lead a continent life than the control of his thoughts. It is almost a truism to say that the man who thinks about sexual matters, especially the one who allows his imagination to run wild upon all kinds of sexually stimulating images is only inviting temptation to relax his continence. If he controls his *thoughts* during those times when he is less amenable to temptation, he is far more likely to be able to control his *acts* at those times when his physical condition makes him most amenable to temptation. The most effective way to control the thoughts is for one to become wholly engrossed in work which is entirely independent of sexual experiences and considerations. The unoccupied mind and physique naturally give themselves to the craving of their strongest instinctive desires. Only the mind and body that are absorbed in work are apt to be free from sexual desires.

In this connection it must be noted that literature which presents sexual images is to be barred. To let the mind chase in wild fantasy from one imaginary sexual delight to another is beating a sure and certain path to those places where in reality and not in imagery the desires may be gratified. Likewise, the pictures which call forth sexual imagery are to be forbidden. The eye readily sets the mind at work with all sorts of imaginations which sooner or later lead to the defeat of continence. There seems to be no alternative. If such influences are not kept from the mind, the fight for a long continued continence seems almost hopeless. What we have said applies more especially to persons who are

2. Winfield S. Hall, *Reproduction and Sexual Hygiene*, p. 147.

adolescents or older. The relation of the sexes during childhood will be discussed later.

Inhibition of all sexual desires, then, is the only safe rule known to psychology. To play with temptation, even to cherish thoughts concerning sexual relations, is to invite defeat. There may be a few persons of adamantine structure who can play freely with sex stimulations and always catch themselves in the nick of time; but for the great mass of humanity such a course is fatal. Parents and teachers ought to agree on this point, for there seems to be so little evidence against such a viewpoint that one can assume a dogmatic attitude against all tendencies to disregard the inherent dangers of sex intimacies. The sex desires are too strong, too much wrapped up in the very core and fibre of human nature, to be allowed any privileges. Unless they are always tightly tethered they will stray into forbidden fields.

RESPONSIBILITY OF PARENTS. The home is the institution which brings children into the world and to it, therefore, society must look for guidance in all matters pertaining to sex. The reasons for this are obvious. (1) The very nature of sex places it in the realm of intimacies. From the earliest childhood all matters of sex are kept within the narrowest limits possible. In this way a sense of modesty is built up. This modesty serves as a kind of cloud to guard and protect the private thoughts and deeds from the glaring light of public knowledge and comment. In the home the child is taught that the sex organs are to be covered in the most inconspicuous manner so that as far as possible people in the common pursuits of life will not be conscious of them. Children are also taught that it is only to their parents that sex matters are to be confided. Such considerations show that the sex problem is one for the home to solve.

(2) Again, parents who keep in close touch with their children have many opportunities for knowing what particular problems are bothering them. If the child needs help in sex matters, the wide-awake parent will know it sooner than others. The parent can answer all questions, supply what information is needed, and give the child what rules are necessary to guide him. No other person is capable of performing such service for the child because no other person can talk to the child so intimately and so naturally as the parent in the home.

(3) Moreover, parents must be held responsible for the mental and spiritual nurture of their children as well as for their physical growth. Just as the feeding of the children is a family matter—a responsibility placed upon each home—so is the nurture and culture of the child's moral nature to be carried on primarily in the family. The home should give instruction on all questions of life which society has called sacred. This is true also of the ulterior aspects of the sex problem. Just as the mother should teach her daughters to keep house, partly because they are then potential housekeepers of the next generation, so parents should concern themselves in the sex problems of their children, partly because they bear the responsibility of fitting their children to become intelligent parents of the next generation.

THE QUESTION OF SEX INSTRUCTION. In the whole sex question perhaps habits are of far more value than knowledge. The habits of absolute continence ought to be begun in earliest infancy. The firmest possible "thou shalt" and "thou shalt not" ought to be emphasized in early sex discipline. There is probably only one word in the matter of sex experience out of wedlock and that word is NEVER. The habits which secure continence must, of course,

be largely negative and prohibitive in their nature since all the potentialities of sex participation are ever present in the child. No positive instruction is needed as to how the sex organs are to function. Instinct is sufficient for the positive aspects of sex participation; but instinct fails completely to prepare the child for a life of strict continence. Habits, then, must make up this lack.

On the other hand, some knowledge is probably desirable. To build up habits of sex control merely through fear is sufficient for many, but apparently not for all. Some children do not need to know "why they mustn't," while others insist on knowing "why." The parent must use his own discretion here. He alone can judge what information is necessary and when it is necessary. If he consciously keeps in touch with the child, and if he is consciously aware of the constant dangers of the temptations to which the child is subjected, he can solve the problem of sex instruction just as he does the problem of proper dress and food. Moreover, it is not sound to set up rules to guide the parents in such matters. Just as no two men propose to their loved ones in the same words or manner, so no two parents can talk about the mysteries of sex in the same words and manner. The important thing in such cases is not manner but success. "Does the child understand?" is the only question which should concern the parent. The sanity of this viewpoint is readily seen if we remember that no parent could talk over sex matters with two children in the same way. In matters of intimate fellowship and conversation, personalities ignore all rules; and as long as there is understanding, nothing else matters. It may be that no conversation is necessary. It is possible that the parent and child understand each other so thoroughly—so deeply—that no words are necessary. The general interpretation of human relationships may lay such a firm foundation for a mutual understanding that only a look or a flush of the cheek is necessary to convey thoughts of approval and disapproval or of innocence and guilt.

Each family will evolve its own method of sex instruction and the method will not be of chief importance. From many aspects, however, one principle seems to stand out above all others on this question. The parent ought to be sure that the child does understand enough so that he is not unwittingly led into temptation. No parent can be excused for allowing his child to indulge in sex irregularities through sheer ignorance. There are many ways in which the parent can make certain that the child is on the look-out, and therefore the parent ought to be held responsible for being sure that the child has enough knowledge, gained in whatever way seems wise to the parent, to safeguard him from ignorant participation in sex practices. At least, the parent ought to be sure that the child understands that not merely sexual intercourse is forbidden absolutely, but also masturbation and other sex irregularities.

NEED FOR PARENTAL AWARENESS. Studies such as that of Exner's³ show that parents are not always mindful of what their children are doing. Really then, the question of sex instruction is one not of the instruction of children so much as it is one of the instruction of parents. Parents ought to know when their children are in danger. They ought to be constantly on the look-out lest in a single unguarded moment the child falls into unnecessary temptation. If parents would only review their own experiences, perhaps they would have all the data necessary from which to draw their own conclusions as to what is safe and what is harmful. The experiences of one generation of children

3. M. J. Exner, *Sex Education and the High School Age*, in *Religious Education*, Vol. 11, p. 494,

are not likely to be very different from those of another. If, then the parents would review their own experiences, in most cases they would know exactly what ought or ought not to be allowed. If parents feel the need for borrowed experience, for advice and help, they may find it in many well written books. For the most part, however, common sense tells the parent what is proper and what is improper. When he knows this, he is at serious fault if he allows the child to talk him out of his conviction by saying "the other parents let their children."

SOME COMMON MISTAKES. It will be helpful to consider some of the most common mistakes the parent makes in regard to supervising the children. (1) The parent is apt to let the young child play for long periods with strange children, or with other children unchaperoned. Even brothers and sisters should not be allowed to play long at a time where the parent can not take an occasional peep. (2) Also, the young child should not be allowed to associate with older children unless the parent is sure they are safe morally. Quite frequently some older boy teaches a whole group of younger boys much that is vile and harmful. It may be that the older boy is a moron whom the whole community takes for granted. But thoughtfulness on the part of the parent might break up all such evil associations. (3) Parents must be sure that adolescent boys and girls do not mix unchaperoned. Even if chaperoned, they should not be together unless it seems expedient. Let boys play with boys and girls play with girls. Why not? There seems to be no natural necessity for the sexes to mix in play. Boys enjoy their own games and interests. Girls, too, enjoy games and recreations somewhat different from those which the boys choose. There is no reason to suppose that either will suffer loss if rather strict separation is practiced. Parents and teachers are woefully careless in this matter at present. They allow boys and girls to play together in most intimate ways from the days of grade school on up till the university is reached. One can only wonder that there is not more fornication among school boys and girls when he knows how much they are thrown together during those years when their habits of restraint are not well formed. (4) Riding together in automobiles and other vehicles is to be frowned upon. The thrill of the ride, the sense of the distance which soon lies between them and home, the knowledge that in a few minutes they can be back again, all tend to weaken the inhibitory bonds. Parents ought to prohibit all unnecessary riding together of the sexes; and if they will not do so it ought to be done by community law. (5) The dance is questionable from every viewpoint. We have previously quoted from Hall on this point. But even Hall suggests that the old "square" dance was not nearly so dangerous as the modern dance. We might answer him by saying that there are many stories of fifty years ago to the effect that after a dance there was sexual immorality. (6) The extravagant use of perfume is unwholesome. Parents ought to know the effect of perfumes upon the male and ought to inform their daughters. (7) Music which stimulates the physical and sexual rather than the intellectual nature ought to be condemned. Parents ought not to allow such music in their homes nor their children to go to public places where such music is played.

This list could be much extended. There are many ways in which parents show utter disregard for the laws of sexual excitement. There is no cure for sexual immorality but carefulness and sternness on the part of parents. It is a problem for the school, for the church, and for the home. If parents use what knowledge and common sense they have in a strict and unyielding

manner, the sex problem will soon lose its gigantic proportions and much of what we now call "natural" in the actions of young people will disappear altogether. The only way to overcome the common mistakes is to quit making them.

HOW TO TREAT THE OFFENDER. First of all, the proper treatment depends upon the offender and the seriousness of the offense. If the offender is hardened, stubbornly refusing to live a life of decency, isolation is the only remedy. If the offender is a beginner, he ought to be dealt with as such. To be more specific: (1) In the case of young boys and girls who are beginning sex irregularities there should be absolute separation between the guilty parties if both sexes are involved. In addition to this there ought to be punishment, together with whatever explanation of the seriousness of the offense seems necessary. Above all, the experience must be made as painful as human ingenuity can make it. The child must be made to loathe that which he has done. Of course this principle ought to be applied to all ages as well. But where children under puberty are guilty of sex irregularities, strict discipline together with the most painful associations the parents can devise is the only remedy. (2) In the case of the adolescent, all such evil associations and habits should be broken immediately. His associations should be changed even if the family must move to a different locality. This is necessary because in most cases not one or two factors can explain the moral failure, but a whole environment has contributed to the wrong-doing. In many cases it will be necessary to merely break up the "set" or "clique" which is directly responsible. But if the child is put into a new environment, he must be carefully watched to see that he does not make his new friendships and associations on the basis of sexual desires. There is danger that this may be the case if he has participated for a considerable length of time before he was caught. (3) The offender ought to be made to feel that the best way to show repentance is by an upright life. He has done nothing from which he cannot escape if he is willing to pay the price of strict continency. If he will take himself strictly to account, he may yet gain mastery over himself. This, of course, ought to be the parent's attitude, and the child ought to know that the parent still believes in him. Lasting reform is only possible when there is a burning desire to be better on the part of the guilty one. It is the business of the parent to help arouse this attitude at the earliest possible moment. (4) The child must be led to occupy his mind with other interests. (a) Association, not only with those of his own age who are known to be pure-minded and dependable, but also with adults who have his interests at heart will be beneficial. There are many interests such as nature studies, entertainments, walking, swimming, etc., which attract both the adolescent and the adult. Such associations are most helpful. (b) The use of literature, in which wholesome and exciting incidents appeal to the particular interests of the adolescent and tend to call forth the accompanying emotions, is one of the best ways to set fresh streams of thought flowing in the child's consciousness. (c) Hard work and strenuous games which literally exhaust the child may prove helpful. There is little danger of harmful exertion on the part of the adolescent. If he is "dead" tired at night, he is all the better and stronger the next morning. The use of his physical energies in work or play is certain to lessen his sexual temptations. The boy who is held responsible for work—hard work—and who must become tired in order to do his work is not the boy to be pitied but to be congratulated. All things being equal, his sex problems will be solved before he meets them. (d) When boys and girls are thrown

together as they are at school and church, they ought to be properly supervised. There is no need for them always to sit together. In no cases should they be allowed to play "hiding" games and all other games which permit secretiveness. (3) The best way to break up bad associations is to magnify the home life and build up a family spirit. Psychology knows no bonds so strong to reform as bonds of love, kindness, and sympathy. Such bonds can only be established around the family hearth where through song and story, through games and frolics, through joys and sorrows, each learns to live for all; and all learn to live for each. Aside from such methods as these, there is no way to deal successfully with the offender.

SEX INSTRUCTION IN THE SCHOOLS. We have already indicated that whatever sex instruction—knowledge pertaining to sex and sex habits—is necessary should be done by parents in the family. Perhaps there is a legitimate field for the school. The school can, through its established course in physiology, teach the universal physiological principles underlying sex. It can also teach proper exercises, proper diet, proper hours, and in every way help the child to build up a strong healthy mind and body. The school might also help by discovering what children are dull and stupid—even those who are feeble-minded. If the school would study such cases, there is reason to suppose that in time many of the common sex irregularities might be checked. Usually the bright, alert students are so busy with studies, games, and other interests that their minds do not turn inordinately to matters of sex.

Probably the greatest service the school can render in the matter of sex instruction is to cooperate with the parents. This could be done as follows: (1) The school might help the parent become conscious of the constant danger to the child because of his (a) inherent desires and because of (b) the temptations in his environment. (2) The school might prepare a bibliography for the parents which would help parents to deal wisely with sex instruction. (3) The school might cooperate with the parents to do away with all evil influences in the community which tend to foster carelessness in general on the part of the children; and specifically to eradicate all influences which tend to arouse unnecessary sexual stimulation.

We take it for granted that the school ought to supervise most strictly all games where boys and girls play together; and the toilet rooms ought to be under such strict supervision that no irregularities would be possible. In addition to these things, the school should help the parents by striving to create morals. The school, just as the family, should emphasize pure-mindedness and sobriety. If both the school and the home hold high expectations for the children in their moral attainments, the sex problem, like many others, will be forced more and more into the background.

PUBLIC OPINION AND SEX MORALITY. We have already pointed out that the child is always tempted to make sexual experiments because of innate desires. There is little hope of changing this fact, even though we do all we can to help children center their minds on other interests. Therefore, perhaps more than other desires of the child, the desire for sexual experience must be controlled from without. First, the family discipline must be strict. The child must learn that he must no more dabble in sex affairs than he would set fire to the house. Also there must be a stern public opinion in the community. Elsewhere we have discussed the problem of community control of conduct. Here we need only point out that the community ought not to set up attractions which draw the children of both sexes from their homes for common participation in pleas-

ures unless the parents go with them. Again, the community ought to demand strict accountability of all the parents concerning the customs of courtship, and all other inter-sex friendships. The two sexes should mingle only in the full view of the public eye. Nothing should be allowed to go on behind the scenes where the young persons are unprotected by the fear of public disapproval.

Next to murder, possibly, the sin of adultery ought to be looked on as intolerable. The fight for such a conception of sex morality should know no cessation. Each on-coming generation of children has sexual desires as real and as hard for them to overcome as if there had never been others before it. Public opinion, therefore, can never feel that its task is done. Only constant vigilance on the part of those who are responsible for the molding of public opinion can meet the constant tendency to lower the standards of sex control that society has so painfully established. The church, the school, the press must all take an unequivocal stand in favor of all that will help the families maintain a high standard of morality and against every influence which tends to weaken the family control of behavior.

THE PROBLEM OF BIRTH-CONTROL. As societies advance in their national life and culture they tend to limit their off-spring. This tendency is apparent in our own country in the families of the wealthy and professional classes. Birth-control without celibacy usually requires some means of preventing conception; and it is at this point that the problem of birth-control touches the problem of sex morality most vitally.

One of the great restraining influences in sex control is the fear of pregnancy and venereal diseases. To offset this fear, man has ingeniously invented contrivances by which the likelihood of conception and venereal disease can be reduced to a minimum. These contrivances are at present for sale at most drug stores and may be purchased by married and unmarried alike. Some young persons who formerly remained chaste through sheer fear are now encouraged to taste of sexual pleasures because the accompanying dangers of sexual intercourse outside of wedlock have been lessened.

There are many obstacles in the way of preventing the sale of such contrivances, chief of which is the demand for them by married persons who for economic reasons desire to limit the size of their families. The problem resolves itself into this: who shall determine what persons should have such contrivances? The most sensible answer is that the government ought to appoint one or more reputable physicians in each community to advise with married people and to demand that the sale and use of such contrivances be limited to married persons. This would not entirely do away with the use of contraceptives by unmarried persons, but it would greatly diminish it.

REASONS FOR APPARENT PRESENT SEX LAXITY. There seems to be a universal opinion that at present we have reached a stage in our national life when people refuse to regard sex in the same light in which it has been regarded for centuries. Some argue that the family is declining and that promiscuity and free love in the near future may have marked influence on the monogamous family. But there is not much reason to suppose that such notions are entertained except by a few. The vast majority of persons still believe that the monogamous family is the only family possible in a democracy such as ours. Why, then, have people supposed that the old conceptions of the family were being done away with?

(1) Because there has been a sudden change in family life due to a change

in our economic structure. The division of labor now prevalent separates the family into individual units. Formerly each family was a working unit, (2) As a result, the family has tended to divide also for pleasures and recreation. The family life is not as strong as formerly because there is no time for definite family associations. (3) Families are not so closely bound together by religious bonds as formerly. The family pew in the church has been abandoned because the members no longer go to the same church services.

Such tendencies have created certain problems which have their bearing on sex. Young people go out from the homes more than formerly. It is therefore more difficult for the parents to know the dangers to which they are subjected. "Out of sight is out of mind" in many cases. Because of freedom from family restraint there has swept over the country a kind of feminine boldness. Women have not in recent years appeared as modest as formerly. Added to this is the general struggle of the female sex for wider recognition in all phases of life. This has had its bearing upon the problem of sex.

But, on the whole, there is no reason to suppose that we shall long continue in this uncertain state. Family life rests upon basic bonds. There has been no fundamental change in human nature. Parents still love their children as much as formerly. Husbands and wives still are bound together by the same ties that have always bound them. The present period is not one in which proved values are being thrown over so much as it is one of experimentation in social readjustment. Every parent wants a larger life for his children than he has had for himself. Until there is a definite opinion concerning how this larger life can be obtained, there will be some confusion. But because men and women are still bound together by the fundamental human desires—love for the opposite sex, love for children, desire for the welfare of their children, desire for public approval—there is no reason to believe that our society will lose its present family organization and morality.

On the other hand, we must not take the present period in too careless a mood. All times of readjustment are serious. While we may be hopeful that the desirable outcome is certain, there may be many failures, and the process of readjustment may be retarded by manifold blunders in sex experimentation. It is a time for sobriety on the part of leaders—a time for those who believe in set standards of sex conduct to press their beliefs until they are hastily accepted by all. From the psychological standpoint, times of great stress require the strictest attention. When problems are difficult of solution, concentration and not diffusion of interest is the only course to be recommended. If those who believe in strict sex continence will assert themselves, the sanity of their position will again be respected as soon as people have more nearly made their re-adjustments to their whole environment.

SEX MORALITY AND RELIGION. The Christian religion has always interpreted its values of life and conduct so that only a strict continence is desirable. Christianity has stressed the following principles which have bearing upon family life in general and upon sex life in particular. (1) The monogamous family with promiscuity out of the question. (2) Purity of thought as the only way to insure purity of conduct. (3) Parental obedience on the part of children and parental care of the children on the part of parents. (4) The absolute prohibition of adultery and all other unchaste practices. (5) The insistence upon a life of simplicity and sobriety as opposed to a life of gayety and artificial stimulation of the passions.

Strangely enough, many church members have grown lax in the observance of these principles. But the church still holds these principles to be fundamental in its doctrine; and unquestionably these principles will again be re-asserted. A strict disciplinary attitude on the part of the church would be a great factor for sex control at the present time.

SEX MORALITY AND IDEALS. There are certain ideals which may be thought of as sex ideals, that is, they involve sex relationships. (1) There is the ideal of respect for womanhood—especially for motherhood. This ideal should be firmly upheld before children, especially before boys. No influence will be greater than this in keeping the boys from transgressions in sex matters. (2) There is the ideal of a future family life. This calls for a comfortable home, which can only be had through work and thrift. In other words, the ideal of a future family life leads young people to pursue a goal that is sober and serious which occupies the mind. This tends to divert the individual from dwelling too much upon immediate sex experiences. (3) There is also the ideal of having children of one's own. This may even become a matter of patriotic duty. And the ideal of becoming a father or mother has strong inhibitory influences upon the youth in the pre-marriage period. Every young person knows that the ideal family can only be built upon the foundation of sex purity, sex equality, and strict monogamy.

Such ideals as these should be held high in each community until consciously and unconsciously all the young people are striving to attain them. It is thus that character is formed and that evil influences lose their potency.

CONCLUSION. There is no easy road to sex morality. Only the strictest observance of the laws which govern human relations will solve the sex problem. The following points are the most important for consideration in sex morality:

1. Sex matters pertain chiefly to family life. All matters of sex, therefore, belong to the family for consideration rather than to other institutions.
2. Parents should teach their children what they feel the children ought to know about the physiology of sex.
3. The school should cooperate with the parents in suggesting good literature and in securing a proper public opinion and a clean moral atmosphere.
4. Strict inhibition of sexual desires is the only safe rule.
5. The offenders must be dealt with according to the nature of the offenses; but in all cases with strictness and with pain.
6. The offender must have his environment and his thought-life changed so that new interests will engage his attention.
7. The parents must be held responsible for knowing what their children are doing.
8. Boys and girls should not be allowed to mingle promiscuously; and should not associate except under strict supervision.
9. Public opinion ought to be turned against all sex irregularities.
10. Religion ought to stress the desirability of strict constancy and of sobriety of life in general.
11. Such ideals as respect for womanhood, desire for a good future home, and desire for children ought to be held constantly before the young people

MORAL EDUCATION IN THE FAMILY

Chapter XI

THE FAMILY AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION BY NATURE. As soon as the child is born it begins to learn and the members of the family are the teachers. It learns that it gets attention by crying, or it learns that crying does no good except when it is time for food. The child learns very early to read facial expressions, to interpret the meanings of changes in the voice and in many other ways begins the long and tedious process of understanding its environment. This much we take for granted.

We take it for granted also that in the family the child learns to talk, to dress himself, to eat as others eat, to know how to take care of himself to some degree—that is, he knows that fire burns, that deep water is dangerous, that he must not turn on the gas, etc. In other words, we expect that the family shall teach the child how to act “like others.” By this we mean that the family shall instruct the child in the essentials of the traditional behavior of his race, nation, and locality.

Formerly, in America it was taken for granted that the family should teach the child much more than these things. In the family the child learned to become self-sustaining. He learned to work, to think, to take his full part in the family and community activities. Perhaps most of his learning was sheer imitation. He did as others did, with slight individual variations. But he learned almost all he knew in the family. In many cases his experience in the “school” was very meager, consisting of but eight or ten months of actual attendance in his entire school life.

The point we wish to emphasize is that the family is by nature an educational institution. The child by sheer necessity learns much in the family. The question arises as to how much or how little the family shall teach the child.

FAMILY AND CULTURE. More and more in a progressing civilization where knowledge is constantly increasing and where important changes in social habits are wrought through the invention of devices for saving labor, the family must teach not only the “essentials” of living—that is, the moral requirements, how to work, etc.—but the family must also teach those means whereby men get more enjoyment out of life than if they merely work, eat, and sleep. The family is called on to develop some appreciation of what Munsterberg¹ calls the *eternal values* or what Hudson² calls the *truths we live by*. We cannot go into an elaborate analysis of how the family may accomplish such ends, but can merely suggest some simple ways in which life for the child even while in the family may become a series of joyous experiences; and which will prepare him for a thoughtful appreciation of all of life's complexities as he grows older.

(1) *The family may teach the essentials of courtesy.* If it be true that “man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn” then it is important that the family teach the children to respect other persons. This, we believe, is the meaning of true courtesy: that one person shows by his speech and manner his profound respect for the presence, comfort, opinions, and rights of others. Courtesy, if it means this, of necessity implies certain rules of conduct. But these rules of conduct are unimportant when compared with the spirit of courtesy itself.

1. Munsterberg, Hugo, *The Eternal Values*.

2. Hudson, William J., *The Truths We Live By*.

The first principle in learning to respect others is that we shall understand how much like us they really are. There are three or four characteristics of personality which should be explained in the family. (a) Persons desire fellowship and dread to be "left out" of things. (b) Persons have desires and ambitions which are precious to them, and which if ridiculed cause them to be depressed and discouraged. (c) Persons like to be praised for well-doing and tend to increase their well-doing according to the appreciation which is shown. (d) Persons like to be "noticed," like to have their opinions respected. All normal persons like to be shown that they are important and that they are missed if absent from any of the activities of their group.

Now, if we realize that others are like us in their inner longings, we are then in a position to treat them courteously. We can act in such a manner that our fellowship, according to the simple principles we have just laid down, will encourage and help rather than discourage and hinder. We can, for example, show that we respect the thoughts of our friends by listening when they express them. We may ask for their opinions upon matters of interest. We may purposely praise and encourage them in all their endeavors. We may refrain from all unnecessary rebuke and slander. We may teach children that each person has capacities for enjoying the good things of life, chief among which are the good wishes of friends and the right of self-expression; and that each person also has capacities for suffering—suffering not only physical pain, but with a broken heart—because of unkindness and discouragements.

The family affords a kind of laboratory for such conceptions. Children can be taught the essentials of courtesy in the home in their filial and fraternal relationships. They can also be taught that neighbors and strangers must be respected. The outcome of such training ought to be that the child will have profound regard for other persons and that because of this he will be sincerely courteous. We believe a world where genuine courtesy prevailed would be an enjoyable world.

(2) *The family may teach the meaning of beauty.* Beauty abounds in nature; and children may be taught to observe it and to enjoy it. Flora and fauna are rich in their beautiful arrangements of color and in their graceful lines of symmetry and balance. Streams and hills delight the eye which sees more than water and dirt and stone. "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth his handiwork."³ Likewise the works of human hands and minds are beautiful. There is beauty in art and literature and music. Perhaps one of the richest sources of the beautiful is in human lives. Some persons fit so well into the scheme of life, seeming always to know what to do and when to do it. There is beauty in self-sacrifice for the sake of others, beauty in honesty and integrity, beauty in forgiveness, beauty in cooperation.

The average family cannot have much of art or of literature or of music. The quantitative element, however, is not important. The chief essential is that each family make the most of what it has. Each family has Nature with all her beauties, each family has the beauty of personal friendships and fellowships, each family may have some works of literature or of art or of music. There is beauty in the story of Joseph or in the Twenty-third Psalm. There is beauty in Longfellow's *Psalm of Life*, or in Dickens' *David Copperfield* or in Cooper's *Last of the Mohicans*. Whatever is done well has in it somewhat of the beautiful. Each family, too, can have music. It is not necessary to have

a piano or other instrument. The human voice is the natural musical instrument. Let the family sing the beautiful hymns which bind them to each other and to all men. Let them sing songs of home and of country, songs of work and of play, songs of joy and of sorrow.

To be more specific, if some kind of schedule for the family life is arranged so that time each week is set aside for a "family hour" the following simple studies may be carried out: (a) A few great songs can be learned and sung together. (b) A few pictures by great artists can be studied, discussed, criticized, and appreciated. (Good copies of the masterpieces can be had for a few cents each.) (c) A few great poems can be read and committed to memory. A few great novels can be read and the beauty of the style, character portrayal, etc., pointed out. In addition to these things, each member of the family can produce something into which he puts his own conceptions of beauty. (d) Handwork may be used in connection with appreciation of the beautiful. A piece of lace, or a piece of furniture, or a picture-frame—in these days of manual training a hundred possibilities lie within each family's grasp—may serve to develop appreciation of the beautiful in the family. Of course, it need not be said that the object of such procedure is not to develop talent, but to learn to enjoy the beautiful by participation. If, however, talent is developed, it will be so much the better.

THE FAMILY MAY TEACH A SIMPLE "PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE." By "philosophy of life" we refer to some understanding of the nature of the universe and man's place in it. Men are thinking beings and sooner or later they come face to face with the perplexities of life itself. Some of the more common problems which may be dealt with in the family are: (a) the nature of what we call personality, is it immortal?; (b) how can death and suffering be explained in a "good" world?; (c) is the world "good"?; (d) what is the measure of success?; (e) what is the meaning of progress? Such questions could be enumerated at length. If men do not state them as they are stated here, they do deal with them in essence. But how can such matters be dealt with in the family?

(1) *Through the reading and discussing of the views of others on such matters.* We have already referred to some of the uses of literature in the home. Here is another service it may render. The truly great books tell something about what others think of the meaning of life, what is worth striving for, what is good, and what is evil. Such matters are frequently not discussed in the family because of the supposition that the children are not interested. But the children are interested. Here is a partial list of the questions a four-year-old girl asked in one day: (a) "Did God know me before I was born?" (b) "Is God Jesus' last name?" (c) "When people die do they go where they were before they were born?" (d) Is President Harding in heaven? Parents suppose that because children as they grow older do not discuss such subjects they are not interested in them. Probably long before children venture opinions on such matters they have thought about them. Some parents fear that it is unwise to discuss such matters lest the children become morose and melancholic. On the other hand, it may be that discussion is just what is needed, for it is hardly possible for them to escape thinking about such matters. Death is ever present in the community. Children see their playmates take sick and die. Death is associated with sickness universally, and sickness is universal. It may be that some of the morbidity of youth is due to the fact that some of these mysteries are never discussed but only brooded over. The reading of books by the parents and the discussion of such matters occa-

ionally in the family would seem to be desirable. The family itself may be broken at any moment by death, and the shock certainly will be none the greater if the members have had some preparation for it by having placed it in the scheme of things as they are.

(2) *Through family religion.* The interest of the family as a whole in religion is not new. Great religious systems—such as the Roman Catholic—regard the family as a religious unit. The religious census in such bodies is reckoned by the number of families times the number in each family. (a) Religion, for many, gives the most nearly satisfactory answer to many of life's mysteries. It posits a Source of Life as well as a Goal of Life. It places death in its relation to the present and the future. It has much to say about "things temporal and things eternal." It recognizes that men have curious longings and desires to understand the mysteries of the universe. (b) Religion also has much to say about what is good and what is evil. It provides some scheme for judging conduct. It sets up certain standards which it declares are worthy and condemns others as being wholly unworthy. (c) It bids each individual attempt for himself to investigate the spiritual realm. "Surely there is a God, find him" is the challenge of religion.

Usually religion is thought of as a set of dogmatic creedal statements. Such an explanation is inadequate. Religion, naturally and simply, deals with the very problems which interest people. If religion becomes a family affair, if the family as a group discuss religious problems, participate in some kind of religious service, are identified with some religious organization, religion furnishes much material out of which the individual members construct, each in his own way, their separate philosophies of life. We would emphasize, here, however, that it is possible for an entire family to be religious as individuals without experiencing any effects on the life of the family. The point we wish to press here is that the family as a group would profit by a social religion in which all members participated and which was operative outside of the family group.

Christianity is really a social religion patterned after the family organization. Its terms are familial. God is a forgiving Father, men and women are brothers with Jesus as an elder brother. The early church was a brotherhood in which men and women actually loved each other. The church has been strong in her redemptive work when she has lived by these simple ideals. Her failures have been due to her forgetting these simple relationships.⁴

One could almost predict that if the families which at present profess to be Christian would in humility and sincerity live out the principles of Christianity in the home and then in the neighborhood and in their own business dealings the world would soon become one Great Brotherhood which Royce⁵ called the "Beloved Community."

(3) *Through a Study of Family Ideals.* Each family, if it chooses, may develop certain distinguishing characteristics. Some families are polite, others are exclusive, still others are clean or dirty. Some families are known for their thrift, others because they never do well. Some families are known for their brilliancy and gifts as is the Edwards family, and some are known for their moral failures, as is the Jukes family.⁶

4. Cooley, Charles H., *Social Organization*, p. 52-53.

5. Royce, Josiah, *The Problem of Christianity*, I.

6. Winship, A. E., *Jukes-Edwards*, Harrisburg, Pa. R. L. Meyers, 1900.

Each family can develop its own idea of what is worth while. It can determine what achievements it will be proud of and what actions will bring shame upon it. It may have for its ideal that no member shall ever steal or cheat or lie. It may have for its ideal that every member shall attain some degree of success and distinction. It may have for its ideal that helping others is more important than the acquisition of property. Of course, a family may conceivably have for its ideals the opposites of the ideals mentioned. The writer knows a family where two generations ago the ideal was to see how many notches each male member could file in his gun barrel; and he also knows a set of brothers who set out to see which could in a course of time drink the most whisky without becoming intoxicated. But let us take it for granted that most families wish to do what is considered lawful and upright.

When the family makes its decisions regarding the family goals, it is in some measure establishing what it believes are the abiding values. This, perhaps, might be the greatest single factor in the construction of a philosophy of life. If the family can decide on a few things for which it will strive—if there are a few things which, as a family, the members will live and die for—then to some degree that family has decided upon its “values.”

We have taken it for granted that this brief outline suggests a method of conscious procedure. It is a common fact that many families accomplish many of the things we have argued for without setting up any methods or without any definite agreements and discussions. On the whole, however, study and definite agreement on the part of the whole family would secure results decidedly more permanent and satisfying than is possible in an unconscious way. Of course the whole process of cultural education ought to be free from compulsion. There should be no sense of duty, but only of privilege. Each member should feel that his own personal wishes were regarded as sacred.

THE FAMILY MAY TEACH THE NECESSITY OF SELF-RESPECT. We have already made reference to the courteous treatment of others. We now turn to consider the courteous treatment of self. The family, better than any other group, can teach the individual to appreciate himself without becoming selfish. It may be done as follows: (a) By insisting upon the individual's ability to improve himself. The value of habits as a means of overcoming one's native weaknesses ought to be stressed in the family. Somehow, the family life ought to awaken in each member a burning passion to be somebody, to do something worth while, to bring distinction to the family, to bring happiness to his fellow men. Every person cannot be great, but every person can strive toward greatness. Habits of temperance, industriousness, thrift, and self-correction will inevitably bear fruits in the individual life. (b) By leading the individual to dare to be different from the masses of men through the formation of habits of thought and meditation. Life does not “consist in the abundance of things a man possesses.” (c) By teaching the individual to depend upon his own convictions of what is right and wrong. The family has not taught the elements of self-respect to the child unless it has led him to regard his own convictions as being inviolate. He must follow them even till death or else lose his own self-esteem. It is by such attitudes that stability of character is produced.

THE FAMILY MAY SOCIALIZE THE CHILDREN. We use the term “socialize” to mean simply the process which makes a person fit to take his place in society. Each new child that is born is a potential pure stream which will eventually flow into the body politic. To keep this stream free from polluting agencies

is one of the high functions of the family. The family really has but one function—that of child welfare. Even before birth the family provides for the physical care of the child. It must not be satisfied until it has produced a healthy, normal physical specimen. The family must also be sure that no element which it can supply is lacking in the child's mental training. The child must be informed and must acquire sufficient skill to be a serviceful member of the larger social family. Finally, the family must see to it that the attitudes which the child needs to live in a society where all men have equal rights and privileges are fully developed. To prepare the child for social life by giving him a deep-rooted sense of justice, a spirit of humility, a genuine respect for all men because they are men—this is to complete his socialization.⁷

THE FAMILY MAY PREPARE THE CHILD FOR MARRIAGE. Marriage requires such intimate fellowship that much preparation for it is desirable. If the man and woman know each other well before marriage the dangers of friction and incompatibility are reduced. "Love at first sight" stories are romantic when they end well; but tragic when they end in the divorce court. There are certain considerations which might be stressed during the adolescent age. In spite of much soft sentiment, a man can fall in love with the woman he chooses. He can direct his attentions toward one type of woman rather than another. There is no reason for arguing that love can be made wholly rational. On the other hand there is no reason for desiring that love should be absolutely void of the rational. A thorough acquaintance on the part of the contracting parties before marriage is desirable for the following reasons.

1. They need to know each other's standards of living. They need to know what income, conveniences, comforts, and social standards are possible for them. There ought to be no misunderstanding on this point. Disagreement here is often the beginning of unsurmountable difficulties.

2. They need to know each other's conceptions of life's values. What are the sources of pleasure and happiness for each? The man ought to know what his future wife believes, what she likes and dislikes, what her abiding interests are. He ought to know whether she is willing to work, whether she longs for children, whether she believes her family to be superior to his. The woman needs to know similar things about her future husband. Will he be loyal to the marriage vow, will he be sympathetic, will he be forgiving and patient?

3. They need to know each other's religious views. Can they agree on a church? In case there are children, will the children be reared in the church? Is the church a vital factor in the life of each? Will each of them look to the church for help and strength to perform their mutual obligations?

4. They need to know what each other's attitude toward the home is. Will the husband become interested in lodges, clubs, and cliques which will take him away from the home? Will the woman be interested in bridge, in literary clubs, in social life in general so much that she will not care to be bothered with children?

5. They need to know each other's peculiar temperaments. Love is not blind, it is only hypocritical. It sees faults but pretends that it does not. Frequently lovers suppose that all defects will disappear after marriage. This, of course, is sheer stupidity. Can each suffer to be rebuked? Can each forgive the other? Can each be patient when the other is giving vent to his feelings? Can each be loyal "in plenty and in want, in sickness and in health, in joy and in sorrow" as long as they both shall live?

It is well for young persons to talk over such matters as we have outlined with their own parents. The decision involved is so important that sound advice is needed. The ceremony ought to be impressive and performed in the presence of both families. The man and woman ought to be conscious that their own families expect them to succeed. The service should be as solemn and as impressive as religion can make it. The marriage vow is a promise which one is to keep at the cost of life itself. No one, therefore, ought to take such a vow unless he knows thoroughly the person to whom he vows his eternal love and loyalty.

THE FAMILY MAY PREPARE THE CHILD FOR PARENTHOOD. Such family life as we have described cannot exist accidentally. Nature has not provided the human parent with all the knowledge requisite for wise parenthood. Only by education can such wisdom be gained.

Life in the home itself is the best preparation for parenthood. The good child of today becomes the good parent of tomorrow. This is true because the person who has learned how *he* ought to live is the right person to teach *others* how to live. The best school for prospective parents is the home itself where the child learns what children ought and ought not to do. In the family, also, the child learns the meaning of sacrifice, helpfulness, patience and cooperation. No one who has not espoused these virtues is fit for parenthood.

1. *The first law of parenthood is the law of sacrifice.* Just as the amoeba loses its identity in order to become a parent, so the father and mother lose their rights and privileges and desires for the sake of the home and the children. To be willing to have one's plans overthrown, to be willing to have one's rights infringed upon, to be willing to lose one's life for the sake of others is to become fit for parenthood. Before marriage there are times when the joys of anticipated marriage should be held in abeyance until the sober fact of sacrifice is mutually faced by the prospective couple. Every son and daughter ought to learn the lesson of sacrifice before he leaves the family roof. It is not the demand of the sentimentalist, but the demand of the inexorable law of human fraternity. No family can long abide without it.

2. *The second law of parenthood is willingness to work.* No one who is unwilling to work should be married. Women should not consider marriage a safe retreat from the work and worry of the world. Home should be looked upon as the woman's workshop where she labors and suffers and toils for those whom she loves. Her aches and pains are the prices she must pay for being a member of the human family. Others endured them for her. She is identified with the human race through work and suffering. She ought not to expect her husband to earn enough to make her independent of work. As much as her physical strength permits she ought to do her own work, ought to do it cheerfully as her part of the marriage contract.

The husband, too, ought to work unceasingly for the welfare and strength of his family. He ought to be sympathetic with the wife, giving her whatever conveniences he can afford. To earn, even a little, and to spend a little less is necessary. The husband must be a willing worker.

Before children leave their childhood homes this ideal ought to be impressed upon them. Parents who lead their children to try to avoid work are not true to their trust.

3. *The third law of parenthood is the law of contentment.* Marriage is a psychical union. Two personalities are joined together "for better or for worse" till death parts them. Since true marriage is a psychical union and

not merely a joining of two physiques it follows that contentment must be found in the realm of the psychical or spiritual. Happiness in married life depends upon mutual confidence, upon mutual faith in the future, upon mutual forgiveness and forbearance, upon mutual appreciation and sympathy. If these spiritual bonds bind a man and woman together, nothing but death can part them. But unless these bonds bind them the life that once seemed to promise eternal happiness may become a veritable hell. Contentment is not to be found in physical possessions. To be in society, to be noticed and "petted" by women of leisure does not bring contentment. To have the power of wealth, to belong to clubs, to be a political boss, is not to have peace of mind. Contentment in the family is a spiritual possession, wrought out by the daily sharing of each other's burdens. Parents ought to prepare their children for marriage by teaching them this law.

4. *A fourth law of parenthood is the law of compensations.* For every sacrifice, for every tired step, for every care and worry and anxiety there are compensations. (a) There is the compensation of friendships such as can live nowhere but in the home. (b) There are the compensations of vicarious sacrifice. One learns to rejoice because his loss has been another's gain. To see one's children become what he himself one time hoped to be is worth all the suffering and sacrifices which can be conceived. (c) There are the compensations of living on eternally in others. The ancients believed that one of the aspects of immortality was that one lived on and on in his children and in his children's children. This explains the desire of the oriental for children. A barren wife felt that she had, in a sense, brought death to herself and husband. It is a noble thought. Through parenthood we enter the life of the future in spirit even though we shall be absent in the body.

PREJUDICES IN FAMILY INSTRUCTION. By prejudices we mean the more or less permanent opinions or attitudes which one holds without having gone through the process of reasoning. They may be either good or bad. For example, one who has never had any unpleasant experience with Roman Catholics may have a prejudice against them. Or one may have a prejudice in favor of one political candidate when he knows nothing of his personal life or abilities. If one gains the confidence of the adolescent, he discovers that the adolescent's mind is made up on many questions which could not have been reasoned out by one so young. It is evident that such prejudices are formed early in life. Whether one uses tobacco, whether one is a total abstainer, whether one is a democrat, whether one believes in woman's suffrage, depends largely upon his prejudices. These prejudices, having once been taken for granted and thus having been treated as facts, are rarely changed. Now and then men in middle life give up their prejudices, but the rule is that prejudices abide.

In a sense the prejudice is a form of ideal. The prejudice is not only what one believes, but determines what he does. Hence the prejudices for and against people and issues make up the individual. They determine how he will act. If this be true, then the more we can control the prejudices of early life, the more we can control the conduct of later life. The family ought, therefore, to choose definitely what prejudices ought to be formed in the minds of the children, and everything possible ought to be done to "stamp in" these prejudices. Three ways in which this may be done are: (a) repetition of family opinions on certain subjects; (b) allowing the child to participate in movements in which certain issues are at stake; (c) appealing to the child as a guardian of what the parent feels is sacred.

Illustrations of the first method are common in ordinary family life in which the family as a group expresses itself in favor of prohibition. It is a matter of common talk in the family. Those who favor liquor are openly condemned. The children are led to believe that the use of liquor is positively harmful and sinful. They would fight to keep it out. Illustrations of the second method are to be found in essay contests in which the children tell why alcohol is harmful. The child is strengthened in his opinion because he has formally expressed his convictions with all the vehemence he possesses. Oratorical contests and debates tend to secure the same result. What one has thought upon, worked over, and defended lingers in his mind. In the same way, allowing children to wear the buttons of the republican or democratic party tends to make the children feel that they are actually participating in the campaign and helps to build up a prejudice. The third method is illustrated in ancient clan life in which the father passed down to his children the responsibility of conserving the family ideals and traditions. In modern life it is illustrated by appealing to the youth to respect the flag, by calling them "The Americans of tomorrow," "tomorrow's citizens," etc. A study of family life would undoubtedly reveal that in such matters as politics and religion, early prejudices have become the abiding principles of affiliation and conduct. To some extent it is true of occupational choice, though this is not as evident as formerly because under present economical conditions it is often physically impossible for the youth to follow the father's occupation.

SOME DESIRABLE PREJUDICES. From what has been said, it is evident that parents and teachers ought to have some means of establishing right prejudices. Some of the desirable prejudices seem to be: (1) prejudice against liquor, (2) against tobacco, (3) against dishonesty, (4) against laziness, (5) against sex immorality, (6) against hypocrisy, (7) against extravagance, (8) against cruelty, either to men or beasts, (9) against settling disputes by fighting or by war, (10) against disrespect of youth for the aged, etc.

In other words, the parent ought to establish a prejudice in favor of whatever he believes is good in the child's mind. And he ought to establish also a prejudice in the child's mind against whatever he believes is bad. To send out a generation of boys and girls who are zealously in favor of definite ideals and who are definitely opposed to certain existing evil conditions is to perform a permanent service to society.

SOME UNDESIRABLE PREJUDICES. The writer examined one hundred and fifty children in a residence section of Chicago. (See appendix.) They were asked to state what persons or things they did not like and why. The ten most common prejudices are listed. These children were prejudiced against: (1) foreigners, especially Chinese and Jews, (2) against the negro, (3) against the policeman, (4) against school teachers, (5) against priests (Roman Catholic), (6) against the Governor, (7) against the Mayor, (8) against people who dress differently from others, (9) against people who work at common labor, and (10) against those living in other sections.

These children ranged from nine to fourteen years of age. It was evident that these prejudices were the result of family talk and spirit. Even children of working people looked down upon other children whose fathers did a different kind of work. For example, a girl whose father hauled coal looked down upon another girl whose father was a janitor. On the other hand, to be related to a janitor of a nice building was something to be proud of. Usually the chil-

dren were proud if their fathers wore uniforms as was the case of the children of firemen, policemen, and motormen.

One might turn such opinions away with a smile if it were possible. But when one stops to think, these childish prejudices are strangely like the opinions of adults, even of Governors and Senators and of Presidents. To pick out three of the strongest prejudices—racial, religious, and political—which obtain in the world of the adults do we not find evidence for all of these in the minds of the children? It means, then, that to call the Chinaman a “chink” and the Jew a “cheney” and the Italian a “dago” in the presence of children is to suggest to the child a prejudice against these persons perhaps even before he has seen a Chinaman or a Jew or an Italian. Most of the prejudices mentioned above are certainly undemocratic and to be condemned. Parents and teachers can do much to destroy such bad prejudices if they will put them under the light of actual facts.

The list of undesirable prejudices can be extended indefinitely. The family and the play-ground are the chief sources of such prejudices, with perhaps the school as a third source. At the family table, the children hear unnecessary remarks about the school teacher, the preacher, the Sunday-school teacher, the members of the choir, the nearest neighbor, the grocer, etc., until unconsciously the child has formed lasting attitudes. While the family must teach the child to study other persons so that he will know who is worthy and who is unworthy, such instruction ought not to be at the expense of prejudicing him against many of the very persons who by nature can help him the most. Too much stress cannot be placed on the prejudices that may be formed against the school and the teacher, or against the church and the preacher. These institutions ought to have the highest respect of the children. Otherwise they lose their efficacy and their highest purposes are defeated.

PREJUDICES LEARNED AT SCHOOL. Teachers are human, and to be human means to err. Teachers often interpret history in such a way as to form prejudices in the minds of pupils against great Americans who were of a certain political party. Also teachers have been known to make suggestions which the active mind of the child soon converted into a prejudice against certain religious bodies who have their own school system. Sometimes teachers unwittingly prejudice children against other teachers or against certain subjects. There is but one way to overcome this tendency. The teacher must stay within the realm of truth. When opinion is expressed it must be expressed in such a way that it does not have undue influence.

THE RELATION OF “CLUBS” TO FAMILY LIFE. There are so many clubs and organizations of various kinds for youth that their relation to the home-life of the children must be studied. Since the founding of the Y.M.C.A. and later Y.W.C.A. various other organizations such as the Boy Scouts and Camp Fire Girls have arisen. Many churches are now sponsoring such clubs in connection with what they call the “activity” side of church work.

(1) The purpose of such clubs is good. The aim is to get boys or girls of like minds and interests and weld them together into a group for mutual helpfulness. Morality is always stressed. Ideals are emphasized. Knowledge of nature and of man’s mastery of nature are interests which hold the attention of the youth. Usually such clubs are sponsored by upright and capable men or women and altogether they perform a much needed function, especially where the children would otherwise be deprived of outdoor life.

(2) The dangers of such clubs are: (a) That the child is started in the

habit of thinking that he must leave home in order to have a good time. Often such organizations have their beginning as a result of several night meetings. The child has never been allowed to go out at nights before, but his parents yield for the sake of the "Boy Scout" movement. They have confidence in it. Of course, the parents can limit night meetings to this one organization, but there is no doubt that a new feature is introduced into the problem of controlling the boy when he begins to attend night meetings. (b) The problem of expense must be watched. Unless the leader of the group is experienced and wise, the children will spend more than is necessary upon their equipment and upon other treats and tokens. (c) Frequently the leaders do not properly supervise the groups and the young people leave their homes ostensibly to go to the club meeting when in reality they go elsewhere. Some scheme for reporting attendance back to the home ought to be devised for all such groups. (d) Sometimes the clubs find their ideals of democratic attitudes defeated because the members develop an exclusive attitude toward those outside the organization. This danger, though common in all groups, is undemocratic and should be guarded against in all clubs where youth claim to have democratic ideals of service and helpfulness. It is bad psychology to allow the youth to suppose that he is not to live out the ideals for which his organization stands. This criticism applies to all secret and semi-secret organizations. For the most part, such organizations do not make for a general democratic spirit.

These objections may not seem serious, but the writer believes they are. It must be kept in mind that anything which weakens family ties is harmful. Any club which starts the child seeking his pleasures away from home has done an untold injury unless it gives him something better than that which he would have had at home. Such clubs are to be recommended unqualifiedly where they furnish the child with advantages which his home does not supply. However, a different situation arises in those homes where most of the social and intellectual needs of the child can be met without joining a specific group.

Parents must watch such groups lest they do more harm than good. If parents will cooperate with the club leaders, clubs may become a great asset to the general morality of the community. Perhaps the greatest danger of such clubs is that the parents will shift the responsibility which rests naturally on them to the club and the club leader. Of course, the clubs are short-lived because they deal with developing interests in children. The average life of the Boy Scout is under two years, which shows that as the boy grows older he wants associations of another kind. But those months may mean much for good or for evil. In general the clubs are helpful if parents cooperate. Otherwise, they may develop undemocratic tendencies which are overcome with greatest difficulty.

In most communities it is impossible to secure competent club leadership without remuneration to those who do the actual supervision work. Since this is true, it seems feasible to arrange some scheme whereby the clubs will be led by paid workers. Only in this way can complete control be secured. Volunteer services cannot be controlled as is proven in church work. Therefore, with but few exceptions, volunteer work is inferior and unreliable. Boys' and girls' clubs ought either to be put under the supervision of the school system, or else under the supervision of a duly appointed committee. The leaders of the clubs in all cases should be paid a specified sum for their services. Only in this way can (a) continuity, (b) efficiency, (c) cooperation with home and school life be secured. Unless these three elements pervade all club work, it is indeed of a questionable nature.

APPENDIX

THE PREJUDICES OF CHICAGO CHILDREN

In connection with a Daily Vacation Bible School in the Logan Square district of Chicago in the summer of 1918, 150 children ranging in age from nine to fourteen were asked what persons they did not like. They were given all the time they needed to write a list of ten persons they did not like. If they could not think of ten, they were to quit when they had reached their limit. If they could think of more than ten, they were to have opportunity later to write down all they could think of. The test was given as a surprise. The children had no warning and so could not have talked over the matter with others.

The following summary shows the results.

Foreigners (Jews, Chinese, Wops, etc.).....	92
Negro.....	80
Policeman.....	76
School Teachers.....	61
Catholic Priests.....	53
Governor (mostly by the older pupils).....	32
Senator (mostly by the older pupils).....	26
People who dress "swell" or "sporty" or "fine".....	19
Common laborers.....	18
People in other districts.....	17

Many other persons were named by two or more. They referred to certain store-keepers, or a cranky person near the school who would not let them get stray balls, etc. Two things were evident from this examination: (1) There was a high correlation between the answers of children from the same family. (2) A similar correlation, though not so high, existed in the papers of children from the same street or block who were play-mates.

COMMUNITY CONTROL OF CONDUCT

Chapter XII

From many standpoints the family is the unit of society, but the life of the individual is always influenced by the community. The individual is a member of several intimate groups. The family, the church, the neighborhood, the lodge, and the political party are the most common of these intimate groups. The best chapters yet written on the relation of the individual to such groups are those written by Cooley.¹ Without disagreeing at all with Cooley's arguments, we wish to point out that, just as the community partially determines the ideals and habits of the individual so also a group of individuals may change the ideals and life of the community. Four dominant desires on the part of the individual make the community the mold of the individual quite as much as the family. These four desires are familiar to all: (1) Desire for approbation; (2) desire for distinction; (3) desire for influence; (4) desire for sex attraction.

In addition to these basic desires which immediately involve the community and make many family standards futile, there are additional questions of a social nature which make the individual family almost impotent to oppose the community at large. This situation grows increasingly more serious because of the community institutions such as the school, the church, and the playground where the children get their ideas of action and their patterns of conduct quite as much as in the home. The individualistic life of the frontier family is gone, and together with it has gone the simple community where there was a unified community opinion about most matters of social conduct. At present each family is forced to make certain adjustments to the community or become isolated socially. The fear of this isolation is so intense that practically none of the youth can withstand the pressure to follow the crowd, and more and more even adults are yielding. While constant adjustment to a changing environment is necessary, the perplexing problem is to know what the standard of adjustment should be. Too often a mere majority rules instead of common sense. Or it may be that the least innovation which promises distinction will captivate a whole community. Morality, as a result, becomes a community affair. Parents find themselves helpless to build up inhibitory bonds against all the temptations the community presents to their children. This is made practically impossible in cases where children agree with the community rather than with their parents. A brief outline of some of the interests which both the community and the family must deal with will be helpful.

1. *The Problem of Recreation.* While this problem at once suggests adolescents, it is by no means confined to them. It extends as well to all the children in the community, for it embraces games as well as dinner dances, theatre-parties, etc. The first question usually asked is what kind of amusement is desirable? Shall the young people play cards, shall they dance, shall they give night parties. These questions are difficult to answer because the parents themselves do not agree. Another important question is that of Sunday amusements. Shall the boys play ball on Sunday, shall the older adolescents play cards or dance on Sunday evenings? Here, again, the parents find it impossible to agree. A third important question which at present reaches community proportions is the question of the cost of entertainment. How much

1. Cooley, Charles H., *Social Organization*, Chaps. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

shall each child be allowed to spend on pleasure and amusements? If he goes to the picture-show, shall he be allowed to go to the cafe for refreshments "because the other 'kids' go?" Obviously this can not long remain a family affair for many reasons. It would be solvable if people spent money according to their ability to afford pleasures. That is, if only the wealthy spent money freely on amusements, it would be rather simple to teach the children that certain things were denied them because of mere lack of money. But under present conditions it often happens that those who can least afford it are the ones who most freely spend money on pleasures and amusements. For well-to-do parents to limit their children's expenses under such circumstances is to make their own children feel that they are unreasonably stingy—a disastrous attitude for the child to entertain toward the parent, and one which, if not destroyed, always brings grievous misunderstandings. This problem is made doubly hard when one's associates accuse his parents of being "tight" and stingy. The problem of dress is also more closely related to recreation than to any other phase of community life. What styles shall dominate? Shall the girls wear silk hose to school, and silk dresses on ordinary occasions? Shall the girls use paints and rouge as a part of their make-up? Shall the boys wear expensive suits, and shall they be provided with fancy mufflers and expensive neck-wear, lest they be thought "out of class?" Perhaps, as with no other problem, dress becomes one for the community to solve, because individuals dress to catch the eye of the community rather than for decency and necessity.

2. The second problem which confronts every community is *the question of the amount of schooling and work which shall be required of children*. It is impossible to discuss this problem apart from others, but it is of advantage to emphasize it merely by naming it. It is obvious that this problem is closely akin to the problem of recreation. If a boy or girl drops out of school at fifteen and begins to work for a wage, one of two things may happen, according to the way in which the earnings are spent. (1) If the earnings are spent for expensive clothes, amusements, and fineries, then a strong demand is made by the school children to have these same fineries and extravagances. (2) But if the earnings are saved, and if, as a result, the working boys or girls dress plainly and inexpensively, it is almost certain that they will be ostracized by those who stay in school. It is not uncommon for high school boys and girls to look down upon their friends who, for one reason or another, work for wages. In a few years they themselves may take up the same work, which shows how shallow their prejudices are. But such prejudices, even though temporary, are powerful while they last.

3. A third question is that of *possessions and privileges*. This, too, is closely related to other problems, but has some individual aspects. For example, how much money shall be spent for such things as dolls, doll-buggies, coaster-wagons, bicycles, etc.? Shall the children be allowed to "have whatever they want"? Everybody knows that when a boy appears in the street with a new air gun, or when a girl appears in the yard with a new tea-set, all the boys and girls in the neighborhood want the same things. While these matters may seem trifling, they have profound significance in the whole problem of child-training, especially in the explaining of the values of life and of the relative costs and advantages of things for which we spend our money. Furthermore, shall children be allowed to keep late hours? Even though the children in one family do not go to the show, shall they be permitted to stay up till eleven o'clock when other children must go to bed at eight? Or shall some children

run a car whenever they please when other children are not granted the same privilege? Shall children under the legal age be permitted to run a car? The whole question of privileges has a possible range far too wide for our discussion. Obviously no parents can raise a family without hearing all the time about the privileges the neighbor's children have. Many of these whimsical complaints can be laughed at and ignored. But many of them abide in the minds of the children and become causes of friction between parent and child.

4. The problem of *working at home* is important. Some parents demand of their children a great deal of home work. If the household affairs admit of such a division of labor, both boys and girls have specific tasks. But if there are no girls in the family, then some parents require their boys to wash dishes, sweep, clean the house, help with the washing, and assist in all the work that is usual around the house—the work which is generally called “woman’s work.” But it may be that the boys across the street and those in the next block tease and make sport of the boys who must do housework. They may come to ask the boys to go for a hike only to find that they must remain at home to clean house. This presents a serious problem. In such a case it is easy to say that the parent must “lay down the law.” This would be the logical disposition of the matter if the child were lazy. But a new feature enters which is social rather than individual when the neighbor children ridicule; and the parent is not so sure that “laying down the law” will solve the problem. Of course, the same questions arise with girls. Children soon get the idea that they are somewhat superior to others if they are not required to work. Hence the hammer strikes both ways. One child becomes dissatisfied because he has to work—another becomes proud and haughty because he does not have to work. The parents in either case ought to face such a problem in the spirit of cooperation. A frank discussion of the matter by both parents and children might do away with such troubles.

COMMUNITY ATTITUDE TOWARD MARRIAGE. The community has what we might call “the larger mind.” It ought to look at such an institution as marriage from the larger view-point. The individual man and woman are so engrossed with the physical that they are apt to slight the importance of the social and spiritual qualities of marriage. This is especially true since marriage is possible without any period of engagement or without any ceremony of a social or religious nature. There ought to be a community interest in marriage. If, for no other reason, proper marriages are the only insurance of social perpetuity, and the community should interest itself in the marriage question, because of this fact alone. But there are other reasons. The very peace and harmony of the community depend upon happy marriages. It is obvious that the preparation for marriage must be a long one because there is so much to learn. One has to change his whole nature before he is fit to be married, and this requires time as well as knowledge.

(a) Preparation for marriage ought to begin in the home where the children should learn those virtues upon which married life depends. (b) In the adolescent period strict attention ought to be paid to the necessity for absolute continence and for loyalty to vows. The marriage vow ought to be regarded so seriously that nothing but death could break it. This, of course, was Jesus’ conception. (c) There ought to be public announcement of the engagement perhaps a year prior to the anticipated marriage. (d) The community ought to expect of the engaged couple loyalty to each other during this period. It

is hardly conceivable that people can prepare for a monogamous marriage during a promiscuous courtship.

In each community there ought to be some officer, trained by education and experience, who has supervision over the home life of the community. His functions would be: (a) to settle family disputes, (b) to advise in all matters of family life such as the education of children, the increasing of the family's income, etc., (c) to grant marriage license, (d) to record engagements, (e) to enforce all laws which are designed to protect the home. The chief function of such an officer should be to insure proper preparation for marriage. His service to persons after marriage, while it would be invaluable, would be secondary. Such a man should be of the strongest personality, and of the best education and training. The larger cities attempt to do such service through the courts of Domestic Relations. The value of such an officer would justify whatever changes in existing laws would be required.

The schools can contribute much toward the education of prospective parents. They can contribute specific knowledge which the home cannot give. Courses in (a) home economics, (b) eugenics, (c) physiology and nursing, (d) dietetics, (e) educational psychology, (f) sociology, etc., can give the prospective parent much specific information which will prepare him for his future responsibilities. The schools ought to take it for granted that every boy and girl are prospective parents, and require of them such studies as we have indicated. Such a curriculum ought to be wisely arranged and practically presented.

Inasmuch as the legal right to become parents is given by society, society ought to suggest to prospective parents the grave responsibilities of marriage. Aside from personal counsel from the official who issues the license, literature ought to be given to prospective parents. This literature ought to emphasize the following: [1] The importance of the family as an institution for passing on the culture and ideals of the nation and the race. [2] The necessity for permanency in the marriage contract. [3] The necessity for mutual cooperation, sacrifice, forbearance, and tolerance, since the family ties are not to be broken. [4] The necessity for individual family ideals and the responsibility which rests upon parents in the proper rearing of children. This literature ought to include a bibliography so that those who care to do so might purchase books on specific problems of family life. The official who grants the marriage license might be authorized to order such literature as is desired by the contracting parties.

Finally, interference in any way with the family problems by neighbors and others ought to be a most serious crime. The community ought to punish as severely as it knows how all who are guilty of such practices as: (a) The spreading of gossip which creates suspicion in the community. (b) The introduction of suspicion into the mind of husband or wife. A weak home should be to the community what a sick child is to the family. Every means of saving it should be employed. Instead of gossip and suspicion there ought to be prayers and confidence. In the last analysis, society can lower the death-rate of its families as it does of its individual members.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION FOR SOLUTION OF MORAL PROBLEMS. It is rather simple to point out the need for the community as a whole to attack its moral problems. It now remains to point out how community organization can be brought about. We suggest four possible plans.

1. *The community might be organized along school district lines, and the moral problem might be considered an extension of the educational problems of the community.* The parents in a given school district could organize, hold regular meetings, have a definite policy, have investigating committees to report their findings, and acquaint themselves thoroughly with all the problems of moral training. Their interests should be in all moral problems. Unfortunately, many parents think the only vital moral problem is that of sex; and that is for the time being the sex problem is not causing them distress, they need not be concerned about other matters. But as we have outlined above, there are many grave moral questions which are far removed from sex. Such matters as work, amusements, clothes, extravagance, honesty, industriousness are all matters of moral import and should be treated with the same seriousness as are sex matters. The objects of such community organizations would be as follow:

1. To study scientifically the moral influences in the community, and to report the findings at the regular meetings.
2. To draw up a set of community standards which are to be supported by the parents in the community. These standards must of necessity be as strict or as flexible as the will of the group demands.
3. To cooperate with the school authorities, the city authorities, and all other agencies which are interested in sober and righteous living.
4. To advise parents how to interpret the will of the community to the children and to help individual families solve such problems as demand help from others.

This plan calls for the initiative to be taken by the school board together with the superintendent and teachers. It requires that the school board be moral leaders of the community as well as managers of the school system. There ought to be no difficulty arising out of the inability of such men to oversee the moral life of the community. If men are capable of planning wisely for the education of the children, they ought at the same time to be able to supervise their moral environment. In most cases the school board is empowered to call public meetings to discuss any matters pertaining to the school life. To sponsor an organized movement of the parents of the school children for the mental and moral improvement of the community would seem to be in entire harmony with the functions of the school board.

2. *The community might be divided along existing district lines.* Each city of any size has "districts" or "sections." Usually there are unofficial leaders in such districts who are popularly recognized. Such persons might organize the parents in their districts for such purposes as we have suggested. Such an organization, while it might lack something because of its somewhat indefinite boundaries, and while it might not identify itself with a school district, might be even more powerful, because only people of similar minds and purposes would be bound together in a common cause. If the natural leaders of the community, even though they were in the minority, would organize, they could dominate the moral and social interests of their district. In time it would be popular to follow their standards. It would be unpopular not to do so. In such an organization it would be well not to stress too much that the organization sought to control community morals. The effectiveness of such an organization would depend upon the convictions and loyalties of the parents. Temporary district organizations are often formed for the

purpose of opposing something which threatens the welfare of the district. Organizations to prevent the coming in of objectionable manufacturing enterprises in a residence district, or the moving in of negroes among whites is quite common. Districts also organize for the sake of securing new school buildings, or to get advantages from the city government. There is no reason why districts might not organize somewhat more permanently for the sake of their moral welfare.

The proper persons to take the initiative for such an organization are those who because of long residence, or because of native ability (or both), are recognized. Each community and each district has its recognized leaders. Evidence for this is found in women's clubs or in ward political organizations.

3. *A third type of organization might be one which ignores community lines and which is composed of persons who have similar ideas and ideals of morality.* If there were sufficient number—fifteen or twenty families—they could plan an adequate social life along exclusive lines. They could refuse to mix, except in the most general way with all other social groups of different standards. While their exclusiveness seems at first to be objectionable, it is exclusiveness for a high social purpose. Isolation for protection and for moral attainment seems to have many arguments on its side from the standpoint of psychology. Such exclusiveness need not lead to snobbery, but to sobriety, dignity, and efficiency. In most cities the transportation facilities, especially since the automobile is so universally used, are such that geographical boundaries might be ignored for the sake of the unity of kindred minds. Perhaps such an organization would most nearly satisfactorily meet the situation because it would be small enough so that there would be little trouble in getting a consensus of opinion.

4. *A fourth solution of the problem might be along church lines.* This solution in many ways seems the most natural, since the church is supposed to be interested primarily in morals. Of course, persons do not hold social intercourse along church lines, but in most churches of any size there are a sufficient number of persons to work out some organization along the lines already suggested. In this way church members could have a marked influence in community control of conduct. Each church might have two or three groups and thus there might be a dozen or more such groups in a city of ten thousand. A powerful influence could be wrought upon the moral life of a whole city if such organizations were federated, and if the same ideals and purposes were held by all. The responsibility for such an organization might be placed upon the officers of the church. Originally in America the duty of the church officer was to guard the moral welfare of the community. This conception is almost unheard of at present. Furthermore, such a plan for social righteousness would give to each church a definite field for religious work, the lack of which has been the church's greatest weakness. The church, under such a plan, would strive for the redemption and welfare of its own community as well as of the world at large. Such a plan would give point and power to the church's reconstructive work.

The chief values of any or all of the suggested plans would be:

- (a) There would be a unified conception among parents as to what the standards of conduct should be. Thus there would be harmony and agreement between home and community ideals. The psychological value of such an atmosphere is obvious. It is in cases where

there is a conflict of ideals that the moral problem becomes most acute.

- (b) The children in the community would not be subjected to teasing and ridicule for following family standards. In case the parents did not all agree on details of conduct—and it is hardly to be thought that such would be the case—they could at least agree to respect the individual opinions of each family group and could so instruct their children. Children can be taught to respect the rights and privileges of other children just as they can be taught to have respect for their elders, for teachers, and for all who represent the higher ideals of community life such as clergymen and city officials.
- (c) There would be a community spirit, sympathetic in its attitude, which, without making individual families conform to a set standard, would strengthen them in their striving for family goals. Each family would feel that the community was friendly to it. As it now is, many families rightly feel that their worst enemy is the community in which they live. Such a community spirit ought to exist that each child would take pride in living up to the family ideals because the community expected him to do so. The child should be made to feel that the community expected him not to follow the crowd, but to be loyal to his family standards. He should feel that the worst moral breach he could make would be disloyalty to his own family standards. Psychologically, such an attitude would do much to strengthen the family spirit for moral ends. The rule would be that children would be obedient, keep proper hours, spend money wisely—in short, they would carry out family opinions in harmony with the opinions of the community. Certainly a smaller per cent of children would fail if such a community spirit as this strengthened the individual home.
- (d) The instruction of the parents and their interests could be directed toward positive ends. Inhibitory instruction could be reduced to a minimum. Praise could be substituted for what seems to the child as “joy-killing.” More wholesome attitudes between parents and children would make all moral instruction far more efficient. Work-attitudes could be developed under community approval. Instead of the parents being anxious to keep their children from doing certain things which they feel are injurious, they could devote their attention to what the children might do to increase their native abilities, and to enrich their experiences through music, literature, and art.
- (e) Finally, the money, time, and energy, which formerly had been wastefully spent in small group extravagances, might be spent for the uplift of the community at large. There might be community picture-shows, where the family as a family could go; there might be musical entertainments, lectures upon health and other community problems—in short, the whole community might profit by the time and money which were formerly foolishly spent.

NEED FOR UNIFIED ACTION. The chief reason for unified action is that it seems as if all destructive social forces are inherently active. Those who are bent on pleasure-seeking, for example, are bold, aggressive, and unabashed. They openly declare their purposes and often openly defy public opinion until

public opinion acquiesces. On the contrary, those who seek higher planes of moral and social achievement are usually modest, backward, unassuming. Psychologically, it seems as if most high-minded persons are inclined to be peaceful and passive rather than bellicose and aggressive. With these general characteristics before us it is evident that in a given community those who are bent upon the lower forms of living will organize the more quickly. They will invite and urge and persuade their fellow citizens until they are in the majority. By nature, those who would have the higher values of life prevail in the community tend to remain unorganized. They do not want distinction and power in organizations, they do not want to assume that they are better than others, they do not like the opposition that will be manifested. This native timidity on the part of those who have high ideals makes the need for organization all the greater. In no other way can the morals of the community and of the homes in the community be safeguarded. There is need for enthusiasm in restraining evil as well as enthusiasm for moral freedom and license. There is need for courageous striving after the creative influences as well as for those influences which are destructive.

COMMUNITY INSTITUTIONS. In most communities there are at least one school and one or more churches. Perhaps the time has now come when the activities of these two institutions ought to be enlarged sufficiently to meet the needs of the community and family life, or else other community institutions ought to be founded. There ought to be a community educational program of a popular nature which would serve for persons of all ages. This educational program should be: (a) *instructive*, (b) *emotional*, (c) *moral*. It ought to inform the whole community on things of common interest. For this the moving-picture might be used, not only for entertainment, but for information. Vocational information could be given which would be of much value in helping the family to face intelligently the matter of vocations for their children. Moreover, information about constant moral dangers could be put before the community as a whole. Instruction concerning how to combat disease and disease-carrying agents should have a prominent place. Although such information is now given in many cases in connection with school work, the parents do not have the opportunity of keeping up with scientific findings in such matters. The child at school learns about a "balanced" meal, but his mother has never heard of such a thing. The result is that he either feels that his mother is an old fogey or else that the instruction at school about the balanced ration is a bit of "high-brow" nicety. The time has come when the school must somehow acquaint the parents with what it attempts to teach the child. Formerly this was unnecessary. The children at school learned exactly what the parents had formerly learned—even the same books were used decade after decade. But with the advent of new scientific knowledge, with new psychological principles of teaching, and with new curricula which attempt to prepare the child for life as a whole rather than to read, write, and work a few problems, there is a great gap between the school and the home which somehow should be bridged. This is a piece of important work for either the school, conceived of as a community school, or for some other institution designed to cooperate with the school for the purpose of community education. There might also be instruction in political issues, how the taxes are spent, what kind of prisons we have, what other school systems are doing, what new inventions will be common-place when those who are now children are grown to maturity. There are hundreds of things which might be brought weekly to the community

as a whole. Two requisites are necessary for such a program: the community must be led to see its need for such instruction, and there must be a small group of intelligent leaders to take the initiative. How many would support such an enterprise? Not many. Perhaps not more than twenty per cent of the parents would be interested. But these would probably be the best people in the community, and neither the school nor society can afford to lose their leadership. In these days when institutions as well as individuals are rated quantitatively, there is danger of ignoring such proposals because they reach only a small per cent of the people. We had better, on the same argument, close our colleges and universities, since they reach less than five per cent of the population. Our point is that although a small proportion of the people would be reached, leadership for higher standards of living could thus be secured.

There is need also for community entertainment. Each community should have a playground, open at all times, with certain restrictions so that small groups could not have it exclusively. There ought also to be provision made for books—books which children should read—in each community. To have a city library is not sufficient. Most people do not seek cultural influences. Therefore, cultural influences must be taken to the people. There ought to be a community library, accessible at the lowest possible rates to all in the community. There ought to be a committee in each community, or in each city, to recommend books for entertainment as well as for information. There might also be community picnics, community fairs, community dramatics. In short—the community ought creatively to set itself at the task of furnishing its own entertainment. As it is now, almost all its entertainment is hired. This is not only expensive, but it is unwise because people are no longer given opportunity to develop their own initiative and ingenuity. People do not know how to entertain themselves. The most uncomfortable thing that could happen to many young people at the present would be to spend an evening alone in the family with nothing but a few good books or games or perhaps a family hour with many stories told in turn. The purpose of community controlled amusements would not be to compete with private amusement concerns, but rather to set individuals and families and groups of families at the task of entertaining themselves, of introducing the element of play into their lives as something which comes from within rather than something which comes from without by being purchased. The moral effect of such a program would be significant. Not only would minds and emotions be quickened and heightened, but there would be little excuse for the young people going outside the immediate community for their amusements. The problem of controlling the young people would, as a result, be greatly simplified.

There ought also to be some plan for formulating community morals and ideals. The church and the school have performed this task historically, and it may be that with an enlargement of their conceptions of the seriousness of the task they can still perform it. Two lessons need to be taught and re-taught. The first is that morality refers to the manner in which one lives, and that it is not something added to life. The second lesson is that moral principles will not be respected long unless they are rationally explained to and cherished by each generation. In most cases it would be unwise, because of cost and other considerations, to establish a new institution for this constructive community work. Perhaps the work must be carried on by existing institutions, namely, the school and the church. Of these two, it seems as if the school is the better

fitted to perform this wider service, for the simple reason that many persons have peculiar notions about the purpose and function of the church, which would, except in rare cases, prohibit any great extension of its present program. The school should get a new conception of its task. No longer is it in the community merely to teach the children from books, to prepare all who will let it for schools of higher learning. Its new task will be to educate the community through instruction and through holding before the community certain moral ideals. This task will demand more workers, but such a program justifies a larger staff. In a few rural centers such a scheme has entirely changed community attitudes. There is every reason to believe that its effects would be only good wherever the plan is tried.

Such a program would demand of parents that they give up many of their present organizations. Many parents now belong to lodges and clubs which have trifling motives and purposes. That such associations are mutually helpful cannot be denied. But there is no reason why organizations for the control of the moral life of the community might not furnish sufficient fellowship. To be engaged with others in some important and lasting work is the best basis for friendly fellowship.

CONCLUSION

Chapter XIII

The study of human behavior is so incomprehensibly great that any one is justified in doing his little part to solve its mysteries. If men knew absolutely how they ought to live and how to rear their children, such studies as this would be unprofitable. But until we know more about how to secure desirable conduct from human beings than we know at present, such studies have a place in academic thought. If education seeks human progress, it cannot put too much emphasis upon morality. Men are seemingly conquering their environment faster than they are mastering themselves. We are told that the next war will wipe out hundreds of millions of men, instead of the mere hundreds of thousands which wars have been wont to claim. We have gained much information about the structure of the material universe in the last few years. By means of radium, helium and other recently discovered properties of matter we are beginning a new era of life as far as inventions are concerned. But as long as we continue to be human beings we shall still need the humble virtues of love, sympathy and kindness. There is no substitute for them.

Suggestions as to how such virtues may be built up in the individual are always in place. If all human beings were as good as they could be, surely human happiness would be much greater. Even if men were as good as they know how to be, the world would be better than it is. This dissertation attempts to throw some light upon both of these problems. It attempts to show how men may be taught to become as good as they know they ought to be; and it also attempts to show them how good they ought to be. Living is largely a matter of habits. Most of what we do, we do unconsciously. It is only to be expected, then, that to improve morality we must first of all improve the moral habits of individuals.

The ideas embodied in the preceding chapters can not be realized apart from some organized effort on the part of certain agencies in the community. While this thesis has had for its aim the setting forth of psychological principles in moral training, it has recognized throughout the utter futility of stating principles without also suggesting what persons and organizations shall put the principles at work. In this concluding chapter we shall endeavor to point out what particular agencies shall be responsible for a higher type of morality.

THE COMMUNITY. Men are social beings. No man lives just as he wishes to live. Each man lives partly as others want him to live. Therefore, the community may do much to make a man live as he ought to live. But first the community must know how each man ought to live. The community must rationalize its own opinions so that it is sure they are right. When it has done this, then it ought to insist that each of its members live in accordance with its welfare. The community can, if it desires, improve the behavior of its boys and girls just as it may improve its lawns and streets. If it will interest itself in children by (a) providing good teachers, (b) good playgrounds, (c) good libraries, (d) good officials to serve as example, etc., it can influence most of the children to live as they ought to live. But if it tries to save money at the expense of the children, if it secures poor teachers, denies the children playgrounds, fails to support libraries and has corrupt officials, most of the children will grow up feeling that morality is something that must not be taken too seriously.

Perhaps the best way society can secure morality is to protect the home life of the child. Society ought to concern itself so that each set of parents have sufficient income to raise their children properly. It ought to protect the family from disease and from worry over loss of work. Especially, the community ought to protect the family from gossip and all other influences which tend to disrupt the family bonds, or which make it impossible to bind the bonds again when once they are broken. Each community is an aggregate of homes. The welfare of homes should be the community's chief interest. It should be more interested in the morality of its people than in the commercial prosperity or the number of miles of paving it may boast of. The community need to practice the old adage which says that "example is more powerful than precept." With this in mind the community should quit saying so frequently that its strength lies in the homes which compose it. On the other hand, it ought to place the interests of the homes above every other interest.

As we look forward to the next fifty years, it seems possible to say that the individual who will show us as a people how to secure righteous officials will be doing the greatest service which can possible be rendered to society at large. This is in the sphere of political science and sociology rather than of educational psychology. We venture, however, to make three suggestions. 1. A definite attempt should be made to write into the text books of all school children (a) the extent of the present corruption on the part of officials; and (b) the need for good, clean, honest men to allow themselves to be put into office. It will not suffice to put in a mere paragraph which states that some officials are not what they should be and that all officials should be good men. We need books which deal wholly with the subject of official graft, written in simple language so that all the children of the country can understand the methods of official corruption. At once such a suggestion provokes a smile, because school boards and legislators would never allow such books put into the schools. But any such movement can win in time if people are willing to pay the price for it. At any rate such information can be put into the hands of teachers and more emphasis can be put upon such matters than is now being done. (2. Careful studies should be made to see whether or not it is true that so-called "business" men and lawyers are the only men capable of holding office. Obviously, the fact that about ninety per cent of business men fails some time in their career would indicate that the business man is far from being infallible. The writer believes that more officials should be recruited from such professions as the clergy, teaching, medicine and the higher grade of lawyers. The reasons are simple: (a) Such persons have chosen vocations which offer small remuneration but which call for a maximum of sacrifice; (b) they are men of clean moral habits; (c) they have committed themselves to following the contributing impulses rather than the acquisitive impulses; (d) they have the welfare of children and homes at heart more than any other classes of citizens. 3. There ought to be courses which prepare men for political offices. Such courses now exist in our universities, but more work in this line needs to be done. After careful selection the government might train the future officers in some such way as she now trains the officers in the army and navy.

If it be argued that such schemes are infeasible, it can be answered that the present system is so inefficient that some experimentation is justifiable. We have learned long ago that to say a thing is impracticable is not to prove its infeasibility. The only safe way to prove that schemes are worthless is to try them. Surely we have tried the present system of securing officials long

enough. However, our chief interest is in the smaller community. Only the highest type of person should hold office. It is most difficult to secure high moral standards unless the moral goals for which we strive are embodied in the lives of the community's officials.

MORAL HABITS. Teachers and parent alike are interested in the morality of children. Both are aware of the necessity of some degree of moral stamina in the individual if all their efforts to inform and guide the child are not to become fruitless. Teachers and parents agree, also, that habits are fundamental, James¹ called attention to a very serious mistake which is commonly made in educational speech. We speak of "good habits" and of "bad habits" but we usually feel that bad habits are the more powerful. We speak, for example, of the "habit of drinking" or the "habit of swearing" or the "habit of incontinency" as if habits of this kind were all the habits possible. We ought to talk more of habits of temperance habits of courage, habits of industriousness, habits of honesty, truthfulness, sincerity and loyalty. Virtues may become habits as well as the vices. This fact ought to be emphasized more in educational speech.

1. By nature we have a nervous system which is capable of many kinds of action. It is better to make an ally out of our nervous system than an enemy. With this thought in mind, there ought to be conscious endeavor on the part of parents and teachers to let the child in his early years form no bad habits, and to force him to form all the good habits he can possibly form. Educators and parents ought to concentrate on the early life of the child. The good habits which are possible ought to be formed while the child is young. It must become as "natural" for the child to be honest as it is for him to eat with his fork instead of his knife. It must become as "natural" for him to be reliable as it is for him to undress before going to bed or to dress when he arises in the morning. His moral behavior must become as nearly automatic as possible. If it is necessary for him to hesitate in order to decide whether he shall be honest or not, in all probability he will choose the course of dishonesty. It is the function of the parent and teacher to establish all the desirable moral habits in the child as early as possible. Sin must become impossible for children merely because they have formed habits of not sinning.

2. There must be no exceptions allowed in moral habits. James is right when he says that each lapse a child makes is like dropping a ball of string one is winding. Each slip undoes many turns.² It is unwise to allow children to pit their judgments against the judgment of society in regard to moral issues. The child's moral horizon is so near the line of his own immediate desires that he cannot possibly know what he should do today in order that he may be useful and happy tomorrow. The parent and teacher know what this child should do and it is their duty to enforce their opinions on the child. In spite of all they can do, he will vary sufficiently so that his identity will not be destroyed.

(a) But this implies that parents and teachers know what is right. There can be no progress until parents and teachers are constantly increasing their knowledge of what is right and wrong in the social order. Their function is not to raise up children like themselves. This task would be relatively an easy one. Their task is to raise children who are better than they, children who have a thorough knowledge of what is right and keen aptitude for doing.

1. James, William, *Talks on Psychology and Life's Ideals*, Ch. 8.

2. James, William, *Talks on Psychology and Life's Ideals*, p. 69.

it. (b) It also implies that teachers and parents be familiar with the essential laws of human nature. They must understand the individual child as a member of society. They must know how to change his environment so that the desirable changes can be wrought in the child's life.

PARENTS. (a) Parents should be informed of the grave responsibilities of parenthood. The family itself is the best agency for this task. It can be supplemented by the school and the church. It may be possible for the state to impress the seriousness of family life upon all persons applying for permission to marry. (b) Parents should be led to see the necessity for correcting the child in its early infancy. Moral problems would not be so serious if children were trained in obedience and respect for authority during their early years. (c) Parents should be expected carefully to watch their children, keeping them from harmful associations, instructing them in all matters which by nature cannot be discussed in the school or church. (d) Parents should regard the home as a kind of school which prepares children for later life, for marriage, for parenthood and for business. (e) Loyalty to the family ought to be emphasized. Clubs, lodges, committee meetings, etc., tend to take parents from the home too much. If such organizations are essential, time for them should be taken from business hours rather than from family hours. (f) Parents ought to stress a wholesome family spirit above all other interests. A nice house is by no means synonymous with a good home. Happiness, fellowship, helpfulness and simplicity are the foundations upon which good homes are built. All tendencies toward extravagances should be discouraged. (g) Parents should not allow the children to spend money which they have not earned. It is bad, psychologically, to allow the child to acquire expensive tastes before he has learned the costs of satisfying such tastes. The best start in life the parent can give the child is a set of good moral habits, not money or clothes or an easy time. (h) Parents should be constantly aware of the dangers to which their children are subjected. While they should not become unduly alarmed they should be acquainted with existing conditions so that they can give timely advice. (i) Above all else, parents should live exemplary lives. All their deeds should be the fruits of clean thoughts, pure motives and sober judgments.

SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS. (a) Such persons should be thoroughly trained in educational psychology so that they can measure the abilities of their children for classification in school work. This would be helpful from the moral standpoint because it would, under such a system, be possible to regulate the tasks to the specific abilities of the children, thus reducing discouragement to a minimum. (b) Such persons should also be equipped to supervise some kind of community control of conduct. Society must look to such persons to oversee the life of the children outside of school hours. Playground activities, clubs for both boys and girls, community amusements, library facilities, and all movements which are educational should be under the direction of superintendents and principals. (c) They should also seek to coordinate the school work with that done in the home and in the church which is educational in its nature. In this way the school could perform a double service in the community. It could fill up what is lacking in the home and church influences; and it could suggest more helpful aims and methods for use in the homes and churches. (d) Superintendents and principals ought to give their time to educational matters and not to business. In school systems of considerable size, a business manager should be provided to be responsible for all matters pertaining to buildings, equipment, reports, etc.

In smaller school systems some member of the school board, or some person hired for a nominal sum, could render the same service. The head of the school ought to give his time wholly in determining the educational policies of the whole community. He should know the children personally and scientifically so that he could help each child find his proper place in the school and community. Such procedure would reduce problems of delinquency to a minimum. The suggestions to parents from a trained man would be invaluable. (f) Financial provision should be made so that superintendents could visit other school systems; and so that educators of importance might visit each local school. It should be possible for the superintendent, at the school's expense, to keep in touch with the whole educational movement, and especially to secure competent counsel for such matters as he feels incapable of solving without aid.

SCHOOL TEACHERS. (a) School teachers ought to make teaching a life's vocation. When teachers want to marry, some provision ought to be made whereby they can continue their work as teachers after marriage. A natural teacher who is married is to be preferred to a poor teacher who is single. In France it is not uncommon for a man and his wife to live on the school premises. Sometimes both are teachers, sometimes only the woman teaches. The reason for such a scheme is that until a teacher has had three or four year's actual experience with children she does not fully understand them. (b) Teachers themselves ought to be of blameless character. Their social and private lives should be such that the children of the community could imitate them in every detail. No person should enter the teaching profession who does not at the same time expect to live a sober, temperate life. (c) Teachers ought to be vivacious and winsome. Therefore they ought not to be overworked. Most teachers have too many recitations. Careful studies should be made to find out how many recitations each day or week each teacher can be responsible for if she keeps at her maximum efficiency. (d) Teachers should have the time and the inclination to confer frequently with the parents about the child. Education, in this light, becomes as broad as the child's experiences. Both the teacher and the parent ought to cooperate so that the child's entire experiences are made to serve definite educational ends. (e) Teachers should have time to develop and refresh their own personalities by means of literature, music, art, nature study, and fellowship with superior people. The demands made on the teacher are such that a constant building up of her own life's ideals is necessary. (f) Teachers ought to know the specific moral problems of the community. They ought to know about the pool-halls, dance-halls, parks taxi-cab companies, restaurants, hotels, etc., so that they can know personally and definitely the nature of the temptations of the children of the community. (g) Teachers ought to know how to give mental tests, how to work up the data, how to draw conclusions, how to detect deficiencies in pupils and how to correct faults. They ought, consequently, to be permitted to keep up with the psychological laboratories and to know the best methods of child study. (h) Teachers should know sociology. They should know what demands society has a right to make upon its individual members. They should understand the problems of poverty, crime, ignorance, indifference, and all forms of social diseases so that they may intelligently deal with such maladies at the fountain-head. One of the goals of education is to do away with all destructive forces, and all education is moral from this viewpoint.

SCHOOL BOARDS. (a) Members of the school board should be educators.

If this is impossible at present then as many members of the board as possible should be educated men and women. They must not suppose that their chief duty is to keep the school taxes low. They must think only of giving the best possible education to the children and to the community at large. (b) The members of the school board ought to read current educational journals so that they will be informed about and be sympathetic with modern methods of scientific educational investigation. To put scientifically trained men under uninformed school boards is one of the most stupid proceedings of the modern educational system. (c) The school board should provide some man to manage the business affairs connected with the school system. If necessary, a business manager should be engaged. In all cases the head of the school system should give his whole time to the mental and moral life of the entire community. He should be a teacher of teachers as well as of children. The head of the school board should be interested in the whole community, not merely in the children whom the law requires to attend school. (d) School boards should cooperate with other agencies, particularly with the churches and city officials, to secure wholesome moral conditions. They ought to be looked upon as guardians of public morals as well as directors of the school system. This, of course, demands that they be men of high moral character, and that their lives furnish good examples for the youth of the community. (e) The members of the school board, as far as is reasonable, ought not to be connected with other civic movements which absorb their time and attention. No man can serve his community better than by being a faithful member of a school board. This ought to be emphasized in the selection of school officials. One of the characteristics of the present is the number of organizations certain citizens are identified with. This begets inefficiency and overlapping of interests.

THE NEWSPAPER. Because of its advertisements the newspaper has grown in importance very rapidly during the last quarter of a century. Its growth is due to the fact that it is an advertising medium rather than to the fact that people have demanded news. The reading public could not afford to pay the price of such reading material if the papers were not supported by advertisers. This means that the newspaper must be considered as a commercial organ rather than as an organ seeking community enlightenment. Of course, it serves in both capacities. By its nature, however, it must serve first its paymaster. When it has satisfied the paymaster, it may then consider how it may serve the community. There are individual exceptions to this statement which merely prove the rule.

Nevertheless, the newspaper is becoming more influential in shaping individual and social opinion. Its relation to the general question of morality is patent. The press can do much to foster either corruption or justice. (a) The authority of the printed page casts a peculiar spell over most people of small educational advantages. If the paper says so, it must be true. Since most persons read but one paper this paper becomes the one source of information. (b) The newspaper comes persistently into people's consciousness. In the large cities, every hour of the day papers fresh from the press are being sold on the streets. In crowded cars, in offices, in parks, and in homes the papers are always being read. The paper is influential in molding opinion simply because so many people read it so frequently. (c) The newspaper is also influential because it is written to catch the public ear and the public following. Most text books fail to have a wide reading because of their content and style. But the newspaper purposely caters to the masses. It is read exclusively by

many. For these and other reasons the newspapers are having wide influence in matters of politics, court procedure, modern social movements, international affairs, etc. If the newspaper is to serve society for moral ends, we suggest the following changes:

1. Newspapers ought to seek the cooperation of teachers, clergymen, medical men, social workers, and all persons interested in social morality. Such persons ought to contribute articles to the papers. They ought also to help shape the papers' policies. Without limiting the freedom of the press by law, it would seem possible to bring about some plan whereby each paper might have an advisory board which helps shape the policy of the paper along all lines where moral issues are involved.

2. Newspapers ought to employ on their regular staff experts in social organization and welfare work. The function of such persons would be to inform the community on all matters pertaining to play activities, working conditions, delinquency, disease, recreations, and all matters pertaining to children. If such persons were trained workers, they could speak authoritatively and could wield much influence.

3. Newspapers should control the report of news in such manner that undue publicity is not given to immorality and scandal, and so that due prominence is given to sobriety and temperance in the ordinary pursuits of life. This can be done only as the result of a change in newspaper policy. No longer must the purpose of the paper be to give the people what they want. The purpose can only be to give the readers what they should read, based upon the knowledge of human experience, moral considerations, and psychological principles.

CHURCH OFFICERS. There is an advantage in considering the officers of the church rather than the church itself as a force for moral achievement. Church officers are apt to lose their identity at present. They are no longer known because they are deacons and elders but because they are successful men who happen to be church officers. This is unfortunate. (a) Church officers should be chosen because of their interests in the salvation of mankind by the redemptive forces known to religion and the social sciences. Heretofore they have been chosen too much because they were passively pious. They furnished good examples of what men should not do. We also need men who are examples of what men should do. (b) Church officers should know the moral conditions of the community so that they could direct the influences of the church in the most needed channels. They should be educated men who are thoroughly imbued with the spirit of cooperation. (c) Church officers especially should feel responsible for the moral welfare of the families which compose their respective churches. It should be their especial task to inform themselves about all the moral problems of the families in their churches so that the influence and strength of the church might be efficiently directed to specific needs. If men are to be saved, they must be saved from specific damning influences. This should be the function of the church officer.

FUTURE OUTLOOK. The improvement of moral conduct of men is a difficult task. It demands moral habits. Parents, teachers, and the community must establish these habits in all the children. Educational psychology comes to the aid of parents, teachers, and community officials by teaching them the necessity of knowing the child, the necessity of following a few well established psychological laws, such as the law of repetition and the law of praising desirable acts and punishing undesirable acts. There is no easy road to a high

social morality, but there is a way. Much progress has already been made. We are probably much more advanced than our ancestors of five thousand years ago. But progress will be much faster if we proceed by simple psychological principles than if we follow irrational and untried suggestions. Whether we shall ascend gradually to a higher plane of living, or whether we shall proceed as in the past by rises and falls depends upon the seriousness with which we take the whole matter of child training. There are many indications that we shall advance morally as well as intellectually. The fact that men are now scientifically studying human behavior betokens moral advancement. When we learn certainly how to control and change human nature all the forces which have formerly been employed to secure morality may be directed more efficaciously toward moral ends.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMS, JOHN. *Herbartian Psychology applied to Education*. Boston, Heath and Company, 1898.
- ADLER, FELIX. *The Moral Instruction of Children*, Ed. 1. New York, D. Appleton and Co., 1892.
- ANDERSON, R. P. *Successful Boys' Clubs*, Ed. 1. Boston and Chicago, United Society of Christian Endeavor, 1911.
- BAGLEY, WILLIAM CHANDLER. *School Discipline*, Ed. 1. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1915.
- BEATLEY, CLARA B., *Methods in the Family*. Religious Education, v. 11, 1916.
- BETTS, GEORGE HERBERT. *How to Teach Religion*, Ed. 1., New York, Cincinnati, The Abingdon Press, 1919.
- BLASHFIELD, HERBERT W., *Training for Christian Citizenship in our Church Schools*. Religious Education, v. 15, 1920.
- BLOW, SUSAN E. *Symbolic Education*. Ed. 1, New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1910.
- BOLTON, FREDERICK ELMER. *Principles of Education*, Ed. 1, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.
- BROWNLEE, FRED L. *The Church and Democracy*. Religious Education, v. 14, 1919.
- BRYAN, ELMER BURRITT. *The Basis of Practical Teaching*, Ed. 1, New York, Boston, Chicago, Silver Burdett and Company, 1905.
- BUSHEE, FREDERICK A. *Principles of Sociology*, Ed. 1. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1923.
- BURGESS, WILLIAM. *The Child's Right to Sex Instruction*. Religious Education, v. 11, 1916.
- CAMPBELL, MRS. GERTRUDE H., *Training Little Children*. Religious Education, v. 14, 1916.
- CARVER, THOMAS NIXON. *Sociology and Social Progress*, Ed. 1, Boston, New York, Chicago, and London, Ginn and Company, 1910.
- COE, GEORGE ALBERT. *A Social Theory of Religious Education*. Ed. 2, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.
- COE, GEORGE ALBERT. *The Nature of Discipline for Democracy*. Religious Education, v. 14, 1919.
- COLVIN, STEPHEN SHELDON. *The Learning Process*. Ed. 1, New York, Macmillan Company, 1911.
- COPE, HENRY FREDERICK. *The Parent and the Child*. Ed. 1, New York, George H. Doran, 1921.
- COPE, HENRY FREDERICK. *Religious Education in the Church*. Ed. 1, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.
- COPE, HENRY FREDERICK. *Democracy Beginning at Home*. Religious Education, v. 14, 1919.
- COOLEY, CHARLES HORTON, *Social Organization*, Ed. 1, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. 1912.
- DEVINE, EDWARD T. *The Normal Life*. Ed. 1, New York, Survey Associates, Inc., 1915.
- DEWEY, JOHN. *Schools of To-morrow*. Ed. 1, New York, E. P. Dutton and Company, 1915.
- DEWEY, JOHN. *The School and Society*. Ed. 1, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1899.
- EGGLESTON, MARGARET W. *The Use of the Story in Religious Education*. Ed. 1, New York, George H. Doran Co., 1920.
- ELLWOOD, CHARLES A. *The Reconstruction of Religion*. Ed. 1, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1922.
- ELLWOOD, CHARLES A. *Christianity and Social Science*. Ed. 1, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1923.
- ELLWOOD, CHARLES A. *Sociology and Modern Social Problems*. Ed. 1, New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago, American Book Co., 1913.
- ELLWOOD, CHARLES A. *The Formation of Public Opinion*. Religious Education, v. 15, 1920.
- EXNER, M. J. *Sex Education and the High School Age*. Religious Education, v. 11, 1916.
- FORBUSH, WILLIAM BYRON. *The Boy Problem in the Home*. Ed. 1, Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1915.
- FOSTER, EUGENE C. *The Boy and the Church*. Ed. 3, Philadelphia, The Sunday School Times Co., 1909.
- FROEBEL, FRIEDRICH. *The Education of Man*. Ed. 1, New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1907.
- GILLETTE, JOHN M. *The Family and Society*. Ed. 1, Chicago, A. C. McClurg and Company, 1914.
- GOODSELL, WILLYSTINE. *The Education of Women*. Ed. 1, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1923.
- GRIGGS, EDWARD HOWARD. *Moral Education*, Ed. 4, New York, B. W. Huebsch, 1906.
- HALL, G. STANLEY. *Adolescence*. 2 vol., Ed. 1, New York, D. Appleton and Co., 1914.
- HALL, G. STANLEY. *Youth, Its Education, Regimen, and Hygiene*. Ed. 1, New York, D. Appleton and Co., 1906.
- HADLEY, ARTHUR TWINING. *Education and the New Morality*. Religious Education, v. 9, 1914.
- HOBHOUSE, L. T. *The Rational Good*, Ed. 1, New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1921.
- HOLMES, JOHN HAYNES. *New Churches for Old*. Ed. 1, New York, Dodd, Mead and Company, 1922.
- HORNE, HERMAN HARRELL. *The Philosophy of Education*. Ed. 1, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1908.
- HUDSON, JAY WILLIAM. *The College and New America*. Ed. 1, New York, D. Appleton and Co., 1920.
- HUDSON, JAY WILLIAM. *The Truths We Live By*. Ed. 1, New York, D. Appleton and Co., 1921.
- JAMES, WILLIAM. *Talks on Psychology and Life's Ideals*. Ed. 1, New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1906.
- JOHNSON, FRANKLIN WINSLOW. *The Problems of Boyhood*. Ed. 1, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1914.
- KEATINGE, M. W. *Suggestion in Education*. Ed. 2, London, Adam and Charles Black, 1911.

- KEITH, JOHN ALEXANDER HULL. *Elementary Education*. Ed. 1, Chicago, Scott, Foresman and Co., 1907.
- KELLOGG, MRS. E. E. *Studies in Character Building*. Ed. 1, Battle Creek, Michigan. Good Health Publishing Co., 1905.
- KILPATRICK, WILLIAM H. *Froebel's Kindergarten Principles*. Ed. 1, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1916.
- KILPATRICK, WILLIAM H. *Education of Adolescents for Democracy*. *Religious Education* v. 14, 1919.
- KING, IRVING. *The Psychology of Child Development*. Ed. 1, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1903.
- KIRKPATRICK, EDWIN A. *Fundamentals of Child Study*. Revised edition, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1909.
- LEE, JOSEPH. *Play in Education*. Ed. 1, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1927.
- LOCKE, JOHN. *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*. Ed. 1, Cambridge, The University Press, 1892.
- MAC CUNN, JOHN. *The Making of Character*. Revised edition. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1916.
- MCDUGALL, WILLIAM. *An Introduction to Social Psychology*. Ed. 13, Boston, John W. Luce and Company, 1918.
- MILLIKAN, ROBERT A. *A Scientist Confesses His Faith*. Ed. 1, Chicago, The American Institute of Sacred Literature, 1923. (Leaflet.)
- MOLL, DR. ALBERT. *The Sexual Life of the Child*. Ed. 1, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1912.
- MUDGE, E. LEIGH. *The Psychology of the Week-Day Religious School*. *Religious Education*, v. 15, 1920.
- MUNSTERBERG, HUGO. *Psychology and the Teacher*. Ed. 1, New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1909.
- O'SHEA, MICHAEL VINCENT. *Social Development and Education*. Ed. 1, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1909.
- PARTRIDGE, G. E. *Genetic Philosophy of Education*. Ed. 1, New York, Sturgis and Walton Co., 1912.
- PEASE, GEORGE WILLIAM. *An Outline of a Bible-School Curriculum*. Ed. 1, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1909.
- PETERS, CHARLES CLINTON. *Selection and Organization of Materials for a Course in "The Control of Conduct" for Secondary Schools*. A Thesis presented to the faculty of the graduate school in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy—University of Pennsylvania.
- PRATT, JAMES BISSETT. *The Religious Consciousness*, Ed. 1, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1921.
- PYLE, WILLIAM HENRY. *The Psychology of Learning*. Ed. 1, Baltimore, Warwick and York, Inc., 1921.
- PYLE, WILLIAM HENRY. *The Outlines of Educational Psychology*. Ed. 1, Baltimore, Warwick and York, Inc., 1911.
- PYLE, WILLIAM HENRY. *The Teacher's Ideals of Life and Happiness*. Ed. 1, Columbia, Mo., The Missouri Book Company, 1920.
- RUSSEL, HELEN E. H. *The Use of Pictures in the Church School*. In *Religious Education*, v. 14, 1919.
- READ, MARY L. *Teaching Eugenics*. *Religious Education*, v. 9, 1914.
- ROWE, STUART H. *Habit-Formation and the Science of Teaching*. Ed. 1, New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1909.
- SADLER, M. E. *Moral Instruction and Training in Schools*. Ed. 1. Vol. 1 and 2, New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1908.
- SAXBY, I. B. *The Education of Behaviour*. Ed. 1, London, University of London Press, Ltd., 1921.
- SCHROEDER, H. H. *The Psychology of Conduct*. Ed. 1, Chicago, Row, Peterson and Co., 1911.
- SCOTT, CHARLES B. *Nature Study and the Child*. Ed. 1, Boston, D. C. Heath and Co., 1902.
- SETH, JAMES. *A Study of Ethical Principles*. Ed. 14, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.
- SMITH, HENRIETTA BROWN. *Education by Life*. Ed. 2 London, George Phillip and Son, Ltd., 1917.
- SMITH, HENRY BOMPAS. *Boys and Their Management in School*. Ed. 1, New York, and Bombay, London; Longmans, Green and Co., 1905.
- SNEATH AND HODGES. *Moral Training in the School and Home*. Ed. 1, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1913.
- STARCH, DANIEL. *Educational Psychology*. Ed. 1, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1921.
- THORNDIKE, EDWARD L. *Educational Psychology*. Ed. 1, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1917.
- THORNDIKE, EDWARD L. *Education*. Ed. 1, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1912.
- THWING, CHARLES FRANKLIN. *Education According to Some Modern Masters*. Ed. 1, New York, The Platt and Peck Co., 1916.
- VOELKER, PAUL F. *An Account of Certain Methods of Testing for Moral Reactions in Conduct*. In *Religious Education*, v. 16, 1921.
- WEIGLE, LUTHER A. *The Pupil and the Teacher*. Ed. 1, New York, Hodder and Stoughton, 1911.

- WOODS, ALICE. Training the Child in Freedom. In *Religious Education*, v. 14, 1919.
- WOOLLEY, HELEN T. Personality Studies of Three-Year-Olds. In *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, v. 5, 1922.
- WOOLLEY, MARY E. What Fundamental Social Characteristics May be Developed by Education. In *Religious Education*, v. 9.
- WINCHESTER, BENJAMIN S. *Religious Education and Democracy*. Ed. 1, New York, Cincinnati, The Abingdon Press, 1917.
- WISSLER, CLARK. *Man and Culture*. Ed. 1, New York, Thomas Y. Cromwell Co., 1923.
- WINCH, W. H. *Children's Perceptions*. Ed. 1, Baltimore, Warwick and Tork, 1914.
- WRIGHT, W. ARTER. *The Moral Condition and Development of the Child*. Ed. 1, New York, George H. Doran Company, 1911.
- (Omissions)
- BREED, DAVID R. *History and Use of Hymns and Hymn Tunes*. Ed. 4, New York, Chicago, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1903.
- HALL, WINFIELD S. *Reproduction and Sexual Hygiene*. Ed. 6, Chicago, Wynne Wood Publishing Co., 1908.
- MANGOLD, GEORGE B. *Problems of Child Welfare*. Ed. 1, New York, The Macmillan Company,
- MUNSTERBERG, HUGO. *The Eternal Values*. Ed. 1, Boston, New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1909.
- OSBORNE, THOMAS MOTT. *Society and Prisons*. Ed. 1, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1916.
- ROBINSON, LOUIS N. *Penology in the United States*, Ed. 1, Chicago and Philadelphia, The John C. Winston Co., 1921.



